A HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE TERMS HINAYĀNA AND MAHĀYĀNA AND THE ORIGIN OF MAHĀYĀNA BUDDHISM

A Historical Study of the terms Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna and the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

BY

RYUKAN KIMURA,

LECTURER IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PĀLI AND ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE,
COUNCIL OF POST-GRADUATE TEACHING IN ARTS, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY, AND
FORMERLY RESEARCH SCHOLAR TO THE NICHIREN SHIU, TOKYO

PUBLISHED BY THE

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

1927

PRINTED BY BHUPENDRALAL BANERJEE AT THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS,
SENATE HOUSE, CALCUTTA

Reg. No. 306B.—22-7-27—E.

Dedicated

To

The Sacred Memory of

The Late

SIR ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE,

Saraswati, Sāstravāchaspati,

Kt., C.S.I., M.A., D.L., D.Sc., Ph.D.,

but for whose warm encouragement and

able support this work would possibly

have never seen the light.

PREFACE

Since my appointment as a Post-Graduate teacher in the Department of Arts of the Calcutta University, it has been my intention to write a proper history of Indian Buddhism from the time of its founder up to the Pāla dynasty, or more properly speaking, up to the Mahomedan conquest of Eastern India, and also a history of Buddhist Philosophy bearing on the Original and Developed forms of Buddhism The genius of the late Sir Asutosh, the then Vice-Chancellor and the President of the Post-Graduate Council of the University, was not slow to perceive the bright prospects of a protracted study and research work on the subjects chosen. Under his patronage and encouragement I began my work, but unfortunately for me, the cruel hand of Time has removed that great soul from the arena of this world when any worthy offering of mine was yet to be made unto him. He, however, lived just so long as to witness the progress of my work which was already marked by a few sign-posts—Sign-posts of theses on (1) *What is Buddhism?*[1] (2) *Shifting of the Centres of Buddhism in India*,[2] (3) *Early History of the Original Buddhist School*,[3] (4) *Historical Discussion on Buddhalogy*[4] and (5) *Original and Developed Buddhism in Chart.*[5] The present work has been the fortunate or unfortunate mile-stone up to

[1] Published in the Journal of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol 4

[2] *Ibid*, Vol I

[3] Published in the Sir Asutosh Jubilee Commemoration Vol. III, Part II

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Published by the Calcutta University in book form.

which the Friend-of-Scholars was with this humble enquirer of historical truths.

I thought of publishing all these theses in one volume under the title of 'Introduction to the History of Indian Buddhism.' But Sir Asutosh pleaded the utility of publishing this work separately on the ground of the independent intrinsic merit of it. I had only to yield to his superior judgment. This work, therefore, comes out, as a separate volume, as some of the others have already come.

It is not out of place, I think, to attempt to give here a rough idea of the scope of this work.

The introductory note raises a preliminary historical discussion on the terms 'Hinayāna' and 'Mahāyāna.' It has also aimed at clearing the ideas and associations of other significant dual terms used in the Buddhist literature, such as, (1) *Northern and Southern Buddhism (geographical division)*; (2) *Vyaktayāna and Guhyayāna (from the view-point of Buddha's way of preaching)*; (3) *Sahajayāna and Kathinayāna (from the view-point of religion in practice, etc.* Under this discussion I have been led to consider some of the philosophical and religious movements of the Hindus

The main book is divided into two parts. The first part is mainly devoted to a full discussion of the terms Hinayāna and Mahāyāna from various points of view. The first chapter deals with the significance of the terms Hinayāna and Mahāyāna and concludes that the terms respectively indicate

(1) *'Phenomenological perception' and 'Ontological perception' (from the point of view of Buddha's perception)*;

(2) '*Expedient doctrines*' *and* '*True doctrines*' (*from the doctrinal point of view*);

(3) '*Exoteric doctrines*' *and* '*Esoteric doctrines*' (*from the view-point of Buddha's way of preaching*);

(4) '*Original Buddhism*' *and* '*Developed form of Buddhism*' (*from historical point of view*).

The second chapter of the same part traces the origin of the terms. It has been pointed out that the men of the Mahāsaṅghika school coined the terms. A full comparison of the doctrines and theories of the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Mahāyāna-Sūtras on the Cosmic existence and human being, has led me to conclude that the Mahāsanghikas were the fore-runners of the Mahāyānists. I have shown that all the Mahāyāna-Sūtras are but the exposition of the Buddha's 'Introspectional perceptions' through the instrumentality of the Mahāsaṅghikas.

The third chapter raises the question "Why did the men of the Mahāsaṅghika School coin and use the terms Hinayāna and Mahāyāna?" The inquiry has led me to the conclusion that the attempt of the orthodox party to cry down the so-called heretical Vajjian Monks at the Council of Vaisāli by calling them 'अधर्मवादीन्' (holder of heretical doctrines) 'पापभिक्षु' (sinful monk) incited them to coin words which could assert their own superiority over their rival party. In accordance with this spirit terms like '*Ekayāna and Dviyāna*,' '*Buddhayāna and Arhatyāna*,' '*Bodhisattvayāna and Srāvakayāna*, began to be coined. The Vajjian Monks seem to have had satisfaction at last when they invented the terms '*Hinayāna and Mahāyāna*.'

In the second part I have discussed the different application of the terms Hinayāna and Mahāyāna in the

two periods of the making of Mahāyāna Buddhism (or Mahāyāna-Sutra period) and of Mahāyāna teachers (or Mahāyāna-School period).

In the Mahāyāna-Sūtra period the term 'Mahāyāna' was mainly used in the sense of 'disclosing or unfolding one's own real doctrines,' having not the least indication of 'rejecting other's doctrines' At the same time the terms 'Mahāyāna' in relation to that of 'Hinayāna' indicated only the relation of Buddha's Ontological and Phenomenological perceptions respectively. But in the Mahāyāna-School period specially from the time of Nāgārjuna, these terms began to be used more in the sense of 'rejecting' other's doctrines as a fundamental feature, than merely 'disclosing one's own doctrines.' They indicated a perceptual division still, but, at the same time, were applied to strike out a comparison of one school with another. The interest of this period is that not only schools of the Sthaviravāda and Sarvāstivāda but that of the Mahāsanghikas, the fore-runners of Mahāyānists as well were grouped under 'Hinayānism,' while the schools of Nāgārjuna, Maitreyanātha, Asanga, Vasubandhu and of Aśvaghosa II, though they originally belonged to the Mahāsanghika school in doctrine, emerged as the true Professors of 'Mahāyānism. The work concludes with a consideration of the use of the terms in the time of Nālandā University, the fabulous seat of Ancient Indian Buddhist learning.

The work has already been published in the Journal of Letters of the Calcutta University (Nos. 11 and 12 of the year, 1924). I deferred its publication in book form as I had an intention of adding a few useful appendices to it. *In the appendices I had a mind to dwell on :*

(1) *The significance of the original Buddhism and Buddha's original doctrine*;

(2) *A historical discussion on the relations between the Sūtradhara, Sthaviravādins and Sarvāstivādins*;

(3) *The original homes of the Mahāyāna-Sūtras*;

(4) *The relation between the Mahāyāna-Sūtras and the Mahāyāna-Schools;*

(5) *A historical discussion on the Daśabhūmi or the ten stages of the Bodhisattvas.*

I have prepared some of them, but others are yet to be worked upon, and my protracted illness threatens to defer the accomplishment of the task to some indefinite period. Prudence, on that ground, dictates to publish the work without the appendices. I hope to publish the results of my researches on the above-mentioned subjects in some well-known historical organ as soon as they will be ready for publication.

My hearty thanks are due to my colleague Babu Sailendranath Mitra, M.A., who readily helped me in translating some Pāli passages quoted in this book. My thanks are also due to Prof. B. M. Barua, M.A., D.Lit. (Lond.), for some useful suggestions which I got from him through our discussions on the subject-matter of this book. I cannot thank too much my beloved pupil Babu Kartickchandra Mitra, M.A.,[1] who has helped me in various ways in the progress of writing this book. I am thankful also to my pupils Mr. Binode Behari Dasgupta, M.A., B.L., Mr. Ramanchandra Bhattacharjee, B.A., and Mr. Debendranath Bhattacharjee, B.A., who kindly read through the proofs, prepared the indices and contents, etc., for me. I cannot close the preface without a word of gratefulness to Mr. J. C. Chakravorti, M.A.,

[1] Now Swami Nirlepānanda of the Ramkrishna Mission.

Asst. Registrar of the Calcutta University, and Mr. A. C. Ghatak, M.A., Superintendent of the University Press, but for whose able management the work could not have come out in its present form.

ASUTOSH BUILDINGS, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY.
The 31st March, 1927.

R. KIMURA.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

Chapter I.

Chapter II.

PART II.

Chapter I.

Chapter II.

Chapter III.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Anesaki, Dr. M.—Consideration of Indian Religious History (Japanese).
2. Bunyu, Dr. Nanjio—Catalogue of Chinese Tripiṭaka
3. Barua, Dr. B M.—Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy (Eng.)
4. Beal—Records of Western World (Eng.)
   „ —Translation of the Life of Huen-Tsang (Eng.).
5. Bengali Visvakosa (Beng).
6. Bendal, C.—Catalogue of Buddhist Sans. in the Cambridge Library.
7. Bhandarkar, Sir R. G.—Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism (Eng).
8. Bibliotheca Buddhica—Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-Sūtra (Sans).
9. Bibliotheca Indica—Aṣṭasāhasrika-Prajñāpāramitā-Sūtra (Sans.).
10. Childer—Pāli Dictionary.
11. Ch'ang Bundle—Vol. 2 of Chinese Tripitaka
    „ —Vol. 3 „
    „ —Vol. 9 „
    „ —Vol. 20 „
12. Chanda, Ramaprasad—The Indo-Aryan Races (Eng.).
13. Chih Bundle —Vol. 5 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
14. E. R. E.—Vol. 2.
    Vol 8
    Vol. 11.
15. Hopkins—Religions of India (Eng.).
16. Hoang Bundle, Vol. 10 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

17. In Bundle—Vol. I of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
18. I-pu-tsuṅ-lun-lun (Chinese).
19. Jacobi—Jaina Sūtras (Eng).
20. Jih Bundle—Mahāprajñāpāramitā-Sūtra (Chinese). Vol. 1, Chinese Tripiṭaka.
21. Journal of Letters, Vol. I, Calcutta University.
22. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Royal Asiatic Society (London), Societe Asiatique (Eng. & Fr.).
23. Lai Bundle, Vol. 1 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
    „ Vol. 2 „
    „ Vol. 3 „
    „ Vol. 7 „
    „ Vol. 8 „
    „ Vol. 9 „
    „ Vol. 10 „
24 Lalita Vistara—J. R. A. S., 1900 (Eng.).
25. Lévi, Dr. S.—Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṅkāra-Śāstra-kārika (Sans.).
26. Legge—Fa-hien (Eng.).
27. Macdonell—Vedic Mythology (Eng.).
28. Mahāvagga (Pali).
29. Mahāvaṁsa (Pali).
30. Marshall, Sir John—A Guide to Sanchi (Eng.).
31. Mayeda, Dr. Eyun—Historical Discourse of Mahāyāna Buddhism (Japanese).
32. Matsumoto, Dr. B.—Chugai-Nippo (Japanese).
33. Mitra, R. L.—Nepalese Buddhist Literature (Eng.).
34 Mrs. Rhys Davids—The Book of the Kindred Sayings (Eng.).
    „ „ Katha-vattu (Eng.).

35. Nāgārjuna—Prajñāpāramitā-Śāstra (Chinese Tr.).
" Daśabhūmi-vibhasa-Śāstra (Chinese Tr.).
" Mādhyamika-Śāstra (Sans.)
" Dvādasa-nikāya-Śāstra (Chinese).

36. Oldenberg, Dr. H.—Introduction to Vinaya Piṭaka (Eng.)

37. Pargiter—Dynasties of the Kali-age (Eng.).

38. Philosophical Journal of Imperial University of Tokyo (Japanese).

39. Poussin, Dr. La Vallee—E. R. E., Vol. 2 } (Eng.).
E. R. E., Vol. 8

40. Rhys Davids—Buddhist India
" " Dialogues of the Buddha } (Eng.).
" " Buddhist Birth Stories

41. Raychaudhuri, Dr. Hemchandra—Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect (Eng.).

42. Sai Bundle, Vol. 10 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

43. Sastri, M. M. H. P.—J. B. O. R. S., Vol. VI, Part I (Eng.).
" " Saundarānandakāvyaṁ (Sans.).

44. S. B. E., Vol. XXI, XVII (Eng.).

45. E. Senart—Introduction of La Mahāvastu (Fr.).
" —Mahāvastu (Sans.).

46. Shen Bundle, Vol. 3 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
" " Vol. 4.

47. Smith—Aśoka (Eng.)
" —Early History of India (3rd Ed.), (Eng.).

48. San-ron-gen-gi (Chinese).

49. Su Bundle, Vol. 1 of Chinese Tripitaka.
„ Vol. 2 „
„ Vol. 3 „
„ Vol. 5 „
„ Vol. 8 „
„ Vol. 11 „

50. Suzuaki, T.—Awakening of Faith. } (Eng.).
„ „ Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism } (Eng.).

51. Takakusu, Dr. J.—A Pali Chrestomathy (Pali and Eng.).
„ I-Tsing (Eng.).

52. Tien Bundle, Vol. 1 of Chinese Tripitaka.
„ Vol. 2 „ „
„ Vol. 3 „ „
„ Vol. 7 „ „
„ Vol. 9 „ „
„ Vol. 11 „ „

53. Transactions of the Asiatic Societies of Japan, Vol. XXXV (Japanese).

54. Ui Dr. H.—Nyāyapraveśatarka-Śāstra (Japanese).
„ „ „ —An Article of the Sāṁkhya-system (Japanese).

55. Umada, G.—History of Indian Buddhism (Japanese).

56. Vidyabhusan, Dr. Satish Chandra—
J. R. A. S., 1900, } (Eng.).
Indian Logic } (Eng.).

57. Wang Bundle, Vol. 1 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
„ Vol. 2 „
„ Vol. 3 „
„ Vol. 4 „

Wang Bundle, Vol. 5 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
„ Vol. 6 „
„ Vol. 7 „
„ Vol. 10 „

58. Watanabe, Dr. K.—European Buddhism (Japanese).

59. Wassibiff—Buddhism (Eng).

60. Yüch Bundle, Vol. 1 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
„ Vol. 2 „
„ Vol. 3 „
„ Vol. 5 „
„ Vol. 6 „
„ Vol. 7 „
„ Vol. 8 „
„ Vol. 9 „

61. Yū Bundle, Vol. 1 of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

62. W. H. D. Rouse—Śikṣā-samuccaya (Eng. Tr.).

63. Pāli-Nikāyas.

A Historical Study of the Terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna and the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Introductory Note.

From various points of view, Buddhism has been divided into several features with different terms according to different schools in different countries, as:—"Northern and Southern Buddhism," "Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism," "Guhyayāna and Vyaktoyāna," and "Sahajayāna and Kathinayāna," etc

Through these terms different features of Buddhism have been characterized. However, among them, the most important and at the same time of common application to all Buddhist communities in the world are the terms "Northern and Southern" and the terms "Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna." The former is 'geographical' and it has been formed by European scholars of Buddhism in modern times, while the latter is 'doctrinal' and it has been formed by men of a certain school of Buddhism in ancient times, as these are found in the oldest Mahāyāna sūtras which existed before the time of Nāgārjuna (who flourished about the latter half of the 2nd century and the first half of the 3rd century A.D). These terms are more important than the former, in order to understand the doctrines of Buddhism as well as its history after king Piyadasi Aśoka. For these reasons, there have been attempts by several scholars of Buddhism in the East as well

as in the West, to explain them.[1] They have written on this subject, yet much still remains to be done. For a proper and thorough study of this most important problem we should re-state the whole position anew and try to reach any final conclusion, if possible. Therefore, as the aim of this thesis, my humble self would make an attempt to give a clear explanation on the same subject dealing with a historical study of the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna and the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism. In order to undeistand the subject well and many other important problems of Buddhism involved in it, we shall discuss in this introductory note, first, in short, the Geographical terms, and then we shall take up more fully the doctrinal terms of Buddhism, because the latter are of the most important significance for our purpose, and at last we will discuss the other said terms too, as the adjunct terms of doctrine.

I. The terms "Northern and Southern"— Geographical Division of Buddhism.

As I have told you, this naming was made by European Buddhist scholars after the discovery of many Mahāyāna Sanskrit manuscripts from Nepal by Mr. Brian Houghton Hodgson in the beginning of the last century.[2]

[1] Dr Eyun Mayeda has a discouise on this subject in his "Historical Discourse of Mahāyāna Buddhism," p. 117 (in Japanese)

Dr Bun zabura, Matsmoto, Prof, Kyoto Imperial University, in a paper appearing in the Buddhist daily newspaper "the Chugai Nippo," Sunday, July, 27, 1919

Dr T Suzuki, in his "Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism"

Dr L de La Vallée Poussin in his learned aiticle in the E R E, Vol 8, pp 328 336

Dr Satis Chandra Vidyabhushana in J R A S 1900, pp 29 ff

[2] Full account of his biography and his works has been given in the preface of Nepalese Buddhist literature of Dr R Mitia, 1882, Calcutta, and in the preface of Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts in the Cambridge library, by C Bendal, 1883, etc.

In the year 1833 in January he was appointed as the Resident of Kathmandu, Nepal, and he continued in the same post from that time up to the close of 1843.

During this period he discovered a great number of Sanskrit Buddhist works in manuscripts, the total number being 381 bundles. As many of you know, these have been distributed to various learned Societies like the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Royal Asiatic Society, London; India Office Library; Bodleian Library, Oxford; Societe Asiatique and M. Burnouf and the Bibliotheque Nationale of France.[1]

The existence of these Mahāyāna Sanskrit manuscripts was perfectly unknown before this time not only to Europe, China, Japan but even to India itself. However, this discovery has entirely revolutionised the history of Buddhism, because, up to that time Buddhist scholars of Europe and even of India had the idea that all the Buddhist Canons were written in Pāli. It was only after this discovery that they came to know that there were other ✓Buddhist Canons which were written in Sanskrit as well as mixed Sanskrit, and simultaneously their attention was also drawn to the Tibetan, Chinese and Japanese Buddhist Canons. Henceforth they could not but study Buddhism in different languages. As soon as those Mahāyānic Sanskrit manuscripts were discovered, they came to know that the Buddhism embodied in those manuscripts is quite different in character, from that embodied in the Pāli canons. At the same time they gradually understood that the Buddhism embodied in the Tibetan, Chinese, and Japanese canons on the whole does bear quite a family-resemblance with Sanskrit Buddhism which was just a little before discovered in Nepal. Thus a new vista dawned in the mental horizon of Buddhist

[1] Dr R Mitra's Nepalese Buddhist Literature, p xxiv.

scholars—new points of views and new visions were the results thereof. This Nepalese Buddhism was entirely different from the Buddhism in Pāli which prevailed in Ceylon, Burma, Siam, Anam Since that time Buddhist scholars of Europe made two-fold divisions of Buddhism as a whole from the geographical point of view. Or in other words, they took India as the centre and countries like Nepal, Tibet, China and Japan, etc, where Buddhism is prevailing in a different shape, are situated in the Northern direction, so they applied the terms "Northern Buddhism" to this, while in as much as the countries like Ceylon, Burma and Siam, etc, where Pāli Buddhism is prevailing are situated in a Southern direction from India, they termed it "Southern Buddhism"

Let it be said here that this geographical division is not perfectly correct as Dr. J. Takakusu and Dr. K. Watanabe[1] have pointed out. Because although the Islands of Java and Sumatra lie in a Southern direction from India, yet we must not forget, that their Buddhism was entirely on the same par with Northern Buddhism. But this division seems to be very convenient for understanding different forms, different religious types, different doctrines, different philosophics, different canons in different languages with different antecedents.

From the point of religious type or character "Southern Buddhism" is Original form of Buddhism,[2] while that of the "Northern Buddhism" is partially Original, and partially Developed, form of Buddhism. As you know, the so-called "Southern Buddhism" was originally spread from India to Ceylon at the time of King Aśoka about 250 B.C. by the missionary propagation of Mahinda, the son of king Aśoka and his other five

[1] A Pāli Chrestomathy of Dr J. Takakusu, p xi. Dr K Watanabe's European Buddhism, p 11 (in Japanese)

[2] See Appendix

colleagues, *viz.*, Iṭṭhiya, Utteya, Sambala, Bhaddasāla and Sumana, the son of his sister.[1] From Ceylon it has spread into other different countries. The Buddhism which was in vogue among the Sthaviras in the time of king Aśoka was the Original form of Buddhism.[2] Because this Sthavira doctrine alone spread into Ceylon and other Southern countries, therefore, it is termed "Southern Buddhism." And that was precisely the Original Doctrine. On the other hand, speaking generally, we must also bear in mind that what is termed "Northern Buddhism" is a growth mainly in Post-Aśokan times. The Sthaviras including even those who in Aśoka's time left Magadha and went to Kashmīra-Gandhāra, later on occupied a place in Northern Buddhism under the new name of the 'Sarvāstivādin.' If we analyze the history of Indian Buddhism, we see first, that just after the Third Buddhist Council in the time of King Aśoka, Kukkutārāma in the capital city of Pātaliputra became a centre of Buddhism more prosperous than any other place. But it was in the hands of the Mahāsamghika school.

At first, King Aśoka tried his level best for the unity of the contending Sthavira and Mahāsamghika parties; the Sthaviras could not long stand united in amity with the Mahāsamghika. They left Magadha: at that time they seceded in a body and divided themselves into two parties—one following the line of the Vinaya-bhāṇakas went to Ceylon and the other who followed the tradition of the Sūtra-bhāṇakas went to Kashmīra-Gandhāra.[3] The former as I have told you became the founder of Southern Buddhism while the latter made

[1] Mahāvaṃsa XII 7 and XIII 4 and Aśoka by V A Smith, p 213

[2] Of course at that time Mahāsamghika doctrines were also extended in India But the Buddhism of Sthavira school must be pronounced as Original form of Buddhism

[3] See my "Shifting of the Centres of Buddhism in India" in Calcutta University Journal of Letters, Vol I, and the History of Early Buddhist Schools which will appear in the Vol. IV, Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes (Orientalia)

their centre in Kashmīra and Gandhāra. These Kashmīra-Gandhāra Sthaviras at first kept to their original doctrines, but later on being influenced by Mahāsaṁghikas they were found to emphasise the philosophical aspect of their doctrine more and more and became known as Sarvāstivādin. The Mahāsaṁghika and its lineage schools tried to manifest Buddha's introspectional perception and eventually paved the way for the later establishment of Mahāyāna doctrines. Not only that, some of their parties were themselves the founders of Mahāyāna schools. This is the reason why we called "Northern Buddhism" partially Original Buddhism and the partially Developed Buddhism.

Of Languages: the canons of "Southern Buddhism"[1] so far as I understand, are written in Pāli language at least from the time of Buddhaghosa (about 550 A. D.). On the other hand the canons of "Northern Buddhism" are written partly in Classical Sanskrit, partly in the Gāthā-dialect and partially in Prakrit, and some even in Pāli. This fact becomes very clear at the present time from the manifold investigations done by many scholars both in the East and in the West.[2] We get corroboration on this point from the Chinese translations of Buddhist canons. In some of them the translation suggests clearly Sanskrit originals. In others hint is given of Prākrit as well as Pāli originals. Dr. M. Anesaki has pointed this out in his "Four Buddhist Āgamas in Chinese,"[3] and Dr. J. Takakusu says the same in a learned article in the J. R. A. S., July, 1896, pp. 416-439.

[1] I do not mean to say that the original canon of Southern Buddhism was actually written in Pāli and it is a very difficult task at present to find out exactly the original language in which it was written

[2] The language of existent manuscripts of Northern Buddhism are some in Classical Sanskrit, some in Gāthī-dialect and some in Prākrit Much evidence of this can be had from the discoveries made by men like Stein, Grunwedal, Petrowsky, Klemenz, and Pelliot in Chinese Turkestan and Central Asia, etc

[3] Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan, Vol XXXV, Part (3), *Introduction*

Over and above this, we have an ancient reliable authority. The learned Buddhist monk Vinīta-deva of 8th century A. D. makes statement like this—the Sarvāstivādins used Sanskrit, the Mahāsamghikas Prākrit, the Sammitiyas Apabhransa and Sthaviravādins used Paiśaci.[1]

On the side of doctrine, it may be generally said that "Southern Buddhism" is carrying the original doctrines of Buddha which dealt with his Phenomenological perception, while the so-called "Northern Buddhism" on the other hand is the product of an intermixture of both the original of Buddha's Phenomenological perception and his Ontological perception. In other words, the Northern schools of Sthaviras or Sarvāstivādins and their allied branches generally speaking, are bearing the original character of Buddhism; while all developed forms of Buddhism and its schools are to indicate Ontological side of Buddha's perception.

II. The terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna— Doctrinal Division of Buddhism.

My only object here is to draw your attention to the great importance of the two terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna,—which will help a better and clearer understanding of the subject. A detailed discussion of this topic is of absorbing interest to every student of Buddhism. It is reserved for my main book. Therefore, in this introductory note, I will give you a bare summary of the subject.

The terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna are known only to Northern Buddhism but not to Southern Buddhism As a matter of fact, therefore, we never meet with such

[1] Dr M Anesaki's Consideration of Indian Religious History, p 548 (Japanese) nd Dr. M. M S C Vidyabhushana's Indian Logic, p 119

terms in the Pāli canon of Southern Buddhism.[1] But the terms frequently occur in the canon of Mahāyāna or Northern Buddhism. This Mahāyāna Buddhism, in my opinion, has been developed (or manifested) in the period between the time of King Aśoka and that of Nāgārjuna (roughly 2nd century B. C. to 3rd century A. D.).[2] For a clear conception I would like to discuss the subject under three main heads, namely:—(1) By whom or by which school exactly the terms Mahāyāna and Hinayāna were first coined? (2) From what time the use of the terms, in their present sense came to be current? (3) Why they came to be so used? Let us now take up the first question. Etymologically, 'Mahāyāna' means great vehicle and 'Hīnayāna' means small vehicle. On the face of it, the terms are suggesting a relation of superiority and inferiority of some things. At the same time we understand at once that such relation or strictly a comparison should come up when a man or a school tried to assert superiority over a rival and attempted to reject the adversary's doctrine. A clear study will convince us of an underlying doctrinal basis of difference for which the two terms stand against each other. In the history of Buddhism, we may preceive two aspects of Buddhism, one is what we have termed Original Buddhism and another is the Developed Buddhism. By Original Buddhism we mean the doctrine preached by

[1] Students of Buddhism are apt to be mistaken if they think that the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna can divide Northern Buddhism from Southern Buddhism The so-called Southern Buddhism belongs to Hīnayāna, while Northern Buddhism to Mahāyāna but from the right and critical point of view, Southern Buddhism belongs to Hīnayāna only, however, in Northern Buddhism both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna are existing simultaneously Therefore, we can by no means hold that Northern Buddhism is the exclusive product of Mahāyāna

[2] This period may be conceived as the flowering or formative period of Mahāyāna Buddhism in the course of which it was gradually manifesting itself

Buddha himself in public; while Developed Buddhism means the doctrines which, though existing in Buddha's perception rather implicitly, was manifested and developed later on by his disciples and followers after his Parinirvāna. However, these two different aspects of Buddhism are nothing but only manifestation of Buddha's two-fold perception of the world; that is to say, when Buddha attained Enlightenment he realised the Truth of the Universe. This Truth of the Universe can be presented from two points of view; one is Truth of the physical nature of this world and another is the Truth of the reality behind it. In other words, when he obtained Enlightenment he understood the real condition of the 'Samsāra' and at the same time he penetrated the reality of the Internal Universe. The former I have called Buddha's Phenomenological perception and the latter his Ontological perception. Buddha we must remember was enlightened with both these truths. But the religious and philsophical conditions in India at that time only allowed him to preach the doctrines formulated from a Phenomenological point of view, and his Ontological perception was bound to be left in the hands of his disciples to be manifested afterwards when the proper time for it came. What we call Buddha's Ontological perception was merely formulated and manifested by his disciples and followers; therefore, sometimes we termed it as Developed Buddhism. But we should not forget that history records its growth, but not its origin. All the same, the idea of Developed Buddhism remained in Buddha's perception when he was preaching what is usually called Original Buddhism. Now we see that the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna are applied to two different sets of doctrines of Buddhism. That is to say, in relation of 'time,' the doctrines which are expressed by the term Hīnayāna were promulgated earlier

during Buddha's life-time by himself, while the doctrines expressed by the term Mahāyāna were formulated by Buddha's disciples and followers after his death, were manifestations of his Introspectional perception. Again, in relation of 'space' these two aspects of Buddhism expressed by the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna respectively represents Buddha's Introspectional perception and his Phenomenological perception. Therefore, now it is clear that the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna were applied undoubtedly later on, when the mutual conflict engendering a sense of superiority arose between the Original and the Developed Buddhism in the shape of school. It is also clear that the school of Developed Buddhism wanted to display their own superiority over Original Buddhism, and they named their own school Mahāyāna or the Great Vehicle and called their opponents by the term Hīnayāna or Small Vehicle. Therefore, we see that the terms were coined and applied at a later stage for the first time by the school of Developed Buddhism or the Mahāyānists. This is precisely the reason why we do not find such terms in the Pāli Nikāyas and Chinese translations of Āgmas, but we do find innumerable mention of them in the Mahāyāna sūtras and śāstras. Now the great question may arise, "Who is the founder of the Mahāyāna Buddhism and school represented by it"? Many scholars are of opinion that the founder of Mahāyāna Buddhism and school is Nāgārjuna but we should say that this is a great mistake. If we look at the stupendous work called Prajñāpāramitā śāstra and Daśabhūmi-Vibhāṣā-śāstra[1] of Nāgārjuna, we actually find many Mahāyāna sūtras which have been quoted by the author. And this will convince us at least that before Nāgārjuna there were many Mahāyāna sūtras.

[1] The former is a commentary on the Mahāprajñāpāramitā sūtra and the latter is a commentary on the first two of the ten Bhūmis in Daśabhūmika chapter of

Therefore, it is beyond doubt that Mahāyāna Buddhism and its certain allied schools were already in existence before the time of Nāgārjuna. Again, through Paramārtha's introduction to the 'Nikāya-abalambana-śāstra' of Vasumitra which exists only in a Chinese translation, we come to know that the Mahāsaṅghikas used some Mahāyāna sūtras. If this is a true fact, we are here assured that some of the Mahāyāna sūtras were certainly existing, may be in a different form, even in the two centuries following Buddha's Parinirvāṇa (*i. e.*, 4th and 3rd centuries B. C.).

Not only that, if we compare the Mahāsanghika doctrines with those of Developed Buddhism or Mahāyāna, a bit carefully, we see that both sets of doctrines are closely connected with each other. Again, at the same time we find that the ideas embodied in Mahāsanghika school, are nothing but the aspect of Buddha's Ontological perception. Therefore, my opinion is that Buddha's Ontological perception has manifested itself as Mahāyāna Buddhism through the Mahāsanghika school. Therefore, the origin of Mahāyāna doctrines in the last analysis is Buddha's perception in an incipient stage. But the full manifestation of the Mahāyāna doctrines is due to the Mahāsanghika school which, as you see, acted as an intermediate stage from a historical point of view Hence we can safely say that the Mahāsanghikas were, in a certain sense, the founder of Mahāyānism and at the same time the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna were for the first time coined by the Mahāsaṅghikas but used by the Mahāyānists themselves. Our next problem is why the Mahāsanghikas used such terms at all? In the course of this discourse, a question "when such terms were used?" naturally suggests itself.

According to both Southern and Northern Buddhist records, disciples of Buddha entertained different opinions

even in his lifetime: but these they did individually.[1] However, in course of time these different opinions found vent through different parties and schools at the Vaiśālī Council. Why these different parties and schools in Buddhism came to being will be all clear to us if we do not forget the fact that the Mahāsanghikas as liberal and advanced Buddhists had always a conflict of opinion with the Sthaviras or conservatives who loyally stuck to the original doctrine of Buddhism preached by the Master himself. Hence, the doctrines of these two parties in every respect were different from each other. For this reason in the Vaiśālī Council, the Sthaviras excommunicated the Mahāsanghikas or the Vajjian monks[2] and called them 'Pāpa Bhikkhus' and 'Adhammavādins.' Henceforth the Mahāsanghika party was growing in power and popularity each day in the Buddhist community; but this excommunication pained them much. Since that time Mahāsaṅghikas began to search for such terms by which they could display the superiority of their own doctrines and reject other and after passing through many stages at last they hit upon the term 'Hīnayāna' for the Sthaviras and called themselves Mahāyānists. Now, let us consider "When these terms were first used?" Such full-fledged terms cannot be found all at once. It is reasonable to conjecture that gradually the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' must have come into vogue at a much later time when after many similar other terms were tried and rejected, to belittle the doctrines of Sthavira-vāda. This is quite evident from the fact that we find the use of these terms in Mahāyāna sūtras and śāstras which were

[1] I have made this clear in my "The History of Early Buddhist Schools" in the Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volume, IV

[2] I maintain that Vajjian monks composed the main body of the Mahāsaṅghika schools.

composed about the time of Nāgārjuna and later on. Specially we find the use of these perfect comparative terms in the works of Nāgārjuna. For example, he said in his Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra or commentary of Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra:—

"There are two kinds of Buddhism, one is Hīnayāna and the other is Mahāyāna."[1]

Of course, we meet with the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' some time in the Mahāyāna sūtras which definitely existed before the time of Nāgārjuna, but there the terms were seldom used and even if used, it was not in a comparative sense of superiority and inferiority. From the above we can very well understand that the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' practically came into use in their proper usual sense from the time of Nāgārjuna.

Our next question would then be "How these terms have been formed by the Mahāsaṅghikas?" As we know every word has a history at its back, therefore, on the face of it terms like 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' did not come into use all on a sudden; they must have passed through previous historical stages. As I have already said the Mahāsaṅghikas, before they could finally arrive at these terms, passed through many similar other terms. Then what are these?

If we look at the Mahāyāna sūtras we find many other terms like Ekayāna, Agrayāna, Bhadrayāna, Paramārthayāna, Bodhisattvayāna and Buddhayāna, as synonym of the term 'Mahāyāna.' Among these, 'Ekayāna,' 'Buddhayāna' and 'Bodhisattvayāna' have been used most frequently; and when the term 'Ekayāna' was used in the place of the term 'Mahāyāna,' then the corresponding terms 'Dviyāna'

[1] Wang Bundle, Vol. 5, p 69a of Chinese Tripitaka.

or 'Triyāna' were used in the place of the term 'Hīnayāna.' Similarly when the term 'Bodhisattvayāna' and the term 'Buddhayāna' were used for the term 'Mahāyāna,' then the term 'Arhatyāna' and 'Śravakayāna' were used for the term 'Hīnayāna.'

Again, we see that the term 'Ekayāna' appears in the place where Buddha's Ontological doctrines[1] are dealt with, while on the contrary when there is an indication of Buddha's personality or his theory upon human beings then the terms 'Buddhayāna' and 'Bodhisattvayāna' were used. Now, let us see which is the earlier one of these previous kinds of terms. We find in the Pāli-Nikāyas the term 'Ekayāna.' There it only indicates the 'Astāmgika-mārga.' Hence it is to be more correct, we may say that the term 'Ekayāna' has been used by Buddha himself and the Sthaviras in the lifetime of the Master as well as after His Parinirvāṇa. From what has been said above we are at once led to the conclusion that as soon as the Mahāsaṅghikas were excommunicated by the Sthaviras, the latter attached contemptuous epithets to the name of the former and the former in their turn could not but borrow the term 'Ekayāna' from the Nikāyas Thereby they thought, that it would be the most suitable term to distinguish themselves from the Sthaviras in the point of doctrine and at the same time to assert their own superiority.

Again, they called the Sthaviras by the name 'Dviyāna' to indicate their inferiority. But it appears to me that some time after the Mahāsanghikas were puzzled to find that the term 'Ekayāna' is common to both (both in the Sthavira and Mahāsanghika), so that

[1] When similar Ontological aspects of doctrines are indicated then some time the term '*Satya*' *occur for the term* '*Mahāyāna*' *In such case the term* '*Upāya-Kauśalya*' has been used in the place of the term 'Hīnayāna' such example we do find in the Amitātha sūtra In Wang Bundle, Vol I, p 3*a* of Chinese Tripiṭaka, and Saddharmapundarika sūtra, Part I, p 29, Bibliotheca Buddhica edition

they once more began to search for another suitable term. This time they invented the term 'Buddhayāna' or 'Bodhisattvayāna.' But even at this stage too when they began to think a little deeply over these new terms they saw their shortcoming.

It was clear that the terms like 'Bodhisattvayāna' and 'Buddhayāna' only indicate a particular aspect of Buddhism, namely—Buddha's personality. But the doctrinal side was totally missed and left out of consideration. So they again began to search for yet another newer and more suitable term which would indicate both aspects of Buddhism, and at last they invented the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna.'

One very important point regarding the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' must be here referred to. As a matter of fact the implication of these terms varied in the two periods, *viz.*—first in what we have called Mahāyāna sūtra period (*i. e.*, from Mahāsanghika separation to the time of Nāgārjuna) and second Mahāyāna school period (*i. e.*, the time of Nāgārjuna, Maitreyanāth, Asanga, Vasubandhu, etc.).

As you know the terms were originally coined by the Mahāsaṅghikas and in the sūtra period they applied them to indicate a fundamental doctrinal difference, *viz.*, Buddha's Ontological and Phenomenological perceptions respectively. However, in the time of Nāgārjuna and later on, that is to say, when the Mādhyamika school of Nāgārjuna and the Yogācāra school of Maitreyanāth, Asanga and Vasubandhu came to be established (*i. e.*, in the school period), the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' began to change their connotation. They are henceforth applied not only in a sense of doctrinal difference of Buddha's perception, but at the same time they carry with them the sense of the relation of different schools. the Mahāyānists went further and in

the term 'Mahāyāna' they included only their schools like Mādhyamika, Yogācāra, etc, while in 'Hīnayāna' they put in first not only the original doctrine of Buddha but at the same time Sarvāstivāda schools and secondly even the Mahāsānghika school and as well as their allied schools.

Other important allied terms referred to above, will require elucidation for a thorough understanding of the doctrinal aspect of Buddhism. Therefore, let us next take them up one by one. These terms which should be noted here were quite unknown to Southern Buddhism.

A

The terms Vyaktayāna (or Vyakta-upadeśa) Guhyayāna (or Guhya-upadeśa) [1]

These doctrinal terms indicate Buddha's mode or way of preaching. Etymologically, Vyakta-upadeśa means the exoteric doctrines and Guhya-upadeśa means the esoteric doctrines that is to say, the former indicates the doctrines which Buddha preached publicly among all men, and the latter indicates the doctrines which Buddha preached in secret only for his advanced disciples.

Therefore, Nāgārjuna said in his Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra: [2]—

"There are two kinds of doctrines in Buddhism; one is the esoteric (Guhya), and another is exoteric (Vyakta)" [3]

[1] These are my restoration, because, up to this time, I could not find out proper terms in Sanskrit text In Japanese, the former is called 'Ken-kyo' and latter is called 'Mikkyo'

[2] The commentary of Prajñāpāramitā sūtra

[3] Prajñāpāramitā śāstra fascicul 4 and 65 of Wang Bundle, Vol I p 29a and Vol 4, p 25b of Chinese Tripiṭaka

So far as my knowledge goes, these terms were for the first time invented and applied by Nāgārjuna, the great teacher of Mahāyāna, with reference to the above.

But we should here bear in mind the fact that the meaning of these two terms have varied according as they were applied and confined to different schools, different countries, and different historical periods of the time. For example, the great teacher K'-i, sometimes also called K'-Ko-tō-sh, the founder of the Thien-thai school in China (in 597 A. D. he died in his sixty-seventh year) has applied these terms for a classification of whole Buddhism, in a more radical sense than that of Nāgārjuna. But since the Mantrayāna school was introduced into Japan from China in 805-6 A. D., the terms were applied in a very limited sense exclusively to that school and its own classification of Buddha's doctrine. Hence these terms became in course of time more and more complicated and at the same time, it began to bear a more and more limited sense than that of Nāgārjuna and even of K'-i.

The Mantrayāna school in Japan is mainly divided into two different schools: the first was established by the teacher Kū-kai who is better known by his posthumous title Kō-bō-dai-shi, and another school was established by the teacher Ji-kaku-dai-shi.[1] Both these teachers applied the same terms differently. The former applied the terms in a narrow sectarian sense, that is to say, according to the teacher Ku-kai, the whole of Buddhism, either Mahāyāna or Hīnayāna, either Developed or Original Buddhism, as preached by the historical Buddha, belongs to the 'Vyakta-upadeśa.' While according to him

[1] Ku-kai has founded his Mantrayāna school on the mountain of Koyā. Ji-ka-ku was a great expander of the doctrine of Ten-dai sect in Japan after the great teacher Dengyo. Both have introduced the same Mantrayāna Buddhism from China but their opinions differed from each other.

also the preaching of Vairachana Buddha[1] only is the 'Guhya-upadeśa' and he is not Rupa-kāya Buddha but Dharma-kāya Buddha. It was said that the so-called Vairachana-sūtra records his preaching Against this Ji-ka-ku has applied the terms rather in a proper sense from our point of view and at the same time it seems that the sense of the terms 'Vyaktayāna' and 'Guhyayāna' has a much more correct and complete form than that of the former, even the teacher K'-i or even Nāgārjuna. According to this teacher the so-called Dviyāna doctrine or Hīnayāna doctrine or Original Buddhism is the 'Vyakta-upadeśa.' because it has been spoken by Buddha in public and that doctrine itself represents the Buddha's Phenomenological perception But Ekayāna doctrine or Mahāyāna or Developed Buddhism belongs to the 'Guhya-upadeśa,' because it is the externalization of Buddha's introspectional perception The explanation of Ji-ka-ku is quite identical with the statement of Mahāyāna sūtras; for example. in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra as well as Amitārth-sūtra we find thus —

"तथागात एव शारिपुत्र तथागतस्य धर्मं देशये यान्धर्मांस्तथागतो जानाति"[2]

"None but a Tathāgata. Sāriputra, can impart to Tathāgata those Dharma which the Tathāgata alone knows"[3]

This says quite plainly that Buddha's introspectional perception can only be understood by a man like Tathāgata but to the common people it will appear as esoteric or Guhya.

[1] According to the Mantrayāna school Vairochana Buddha is the only idea Buddha. It means the personification of essence of Bodhi and absolute purity

[2] Saddharamapuṇḍarīka sūtra Vol I, p 30, of Bibliotheca Buddhica edition. And Amitārtha-sūtra In Bundle Vol I, p 46 of Chinese Tripitaka

[3] S. B E Vol XXI p 32

B

The Terms Sahajayāna and Kathinayāna.

The terms 'Sahajayāna' and 'Kaṭhinayana'[1] have been formed from religious point of view or more correctly, from the point of religious practice; that is to say, Buddhism as a whole can be broadly divided into two types from the point of view of religious practice.

Etymologically, 'Sahajayāna' means 'The Easy Path' and 'Kaṭhinayāna,' 'The difficult path.' It is not an easy task to ascertain the origin of the terms historically. However, situated as we are, it would not be wrong to suppose that these terms were formed for the first time, by Nāgārjuna who applied them in order to divide Buddha's doctrines from the point of view of religious practice. This is the reason, therefore, that we meet in his treatise for the first time, these terms as well as their explanation. In his Daśabūmi-vibhāṣā-śāstra we read as follows —

"There are numerous paths which one must tread to reach the Buddhistic emancipation, just in the same way as in the ordinary world we find different paths; the difficult ones and the easy ones Walking along the land-roads is difficult, while sailing in water by a boat is much more refreshing and easy. It is the same case in the Bodhisattva-mārga. The difficult path is that which entails a long rigorous period of religious practice to reach the region of perfect peace from which there is no

[1] The terms 'Sahajayāna' or 'Sahaja-mārga' is met with in Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript, but the term 'Kathinayāna' or 'Kathina-mārga' does not at present occur in the existing manuscripts Therefore, I could not but restore it from Japanese sources. 'Sahaja-mārgo' is called in Japanese 'I-gya-do' and 'Kathina-mārga' is called 'Nan-gyo do'

return. The easy path is that which at once leads easily to the destination by means of faith."[1]

Just after the above, Nāgārjuna has enumerated many names of the Past, Present, and Future Buddhas especially the name of Amitābha Buddha. At the same time he stated like this :

"If one is willing to obtain perfect peace he should worship Buddhas with a heart full of faith and should recite their name." Again, in his Prajñapāramitā-śāstra he has said :—

"If one hears even the name of the Buddha of the holy land (Amitābha Buddha), he would obtain salvation."[2] From the above statements we understand very easily that Nāgārjuna for the first time formed the terms 'Sahajayāna' and 'Kathinayāna' from the point of view of religious practice.

All paths (mārgās) either Hīnayāna or Mahāyāna are included under 'Kaṭhina-mārga' and reciting Buddha's names only comes under 'Sahaja-mārga' From the above, we come to know at the same time that Nāgārjuna encouraged the common people to follow the 'Sahaja-mārga.' We must bear in mind that the idea of reciting the name of Buddha from historical point of view undoubtedly dates as early as original Buddhism.

Now a question may arise, why Nāgārjuna has formed two new terms to indicate the two kinds of path in Buddhism from the point of view of religious practice and why he sought to encourage the common people to follow the 'Sahaja-mārga' rather than the 'Kaṭhina-mārga?' Before we attempt this question, it is very

[1] Da-śabūmi-Vibhāṣhā-śāstra, fascicul 9, i e, Su Bundle, Vol 8, p. 19b of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[2] Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra, fascicul 93, Wang Bundle, Vol 5, p 70b of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

important for our investigation to set clearly before you the exact religious and philosophical atmosphere of India at that time or rather shortly before Nāgārjuna.

In the time of Nāgārjuna shortly before him, both the Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical philosophy[1] as well as religion were much developed and came to hold such an influential position that they were strong enough to push away Buddhism from Central India where it was in the zenith of its power in the time of King Aśoka.

We know from the political history of India that in the course of fifty years after the death of Aśoka his descendants lost their power. The central power passed away into the hand of his Ministers. One of them Pushpamitra when holding a general review of the imperial army at Pātaliputra in the presence of the last Maurya King, Vrihadratha, treacherously, it is said, killed him and the Śunga dynasty under Pushpamitra came into power about 185 B. C Kings of this dynasty were patrons of Brahmanism and specially Pushpamitra had great faith in the Vedic religion ; he sanctified animal sacrifices which were essential to Vedic Brāhmanism, contradictory to the most cherished feature of Buddhism. From Tibetan[2] as well as Chinese records[3] we come to know that Pushpamitra has been regarded as one of the greatest persecutors of Buddhism. He is said to have burnt Buddhist monasteries and slain many

[1] Of the so called six systems of Hindu philosophy, to my mind, the Purva Mimāṁsā and Uttara Mimāṁsā (or Vedanta) alone belonged to the pure Vedic or Brahmanical system, so to speak While the Sāmkhya and Vaiśeṣika were originally un-Vedic, afterwards absorbed and adopted by the Brahmanical or Vedic system I take the Yoga and Nyāya system as common to both Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Śāktism, from this point of view, stood outside the pale of the pure Brahmanical system influenced, adopted and re-shaped according to its own light

[2] Tāranath Schiefner's Translation, p 81.

[3] 25th fasciculi of Samyuktāgama-sūtra, Shen Bundle, Vol 3, p 48*b* of Chinese Tripiṭaka

monks from Magadha to Jālandhara in the Punjab, though we have an epigraph on the gate-way of the Buddhist stupa at Bharhut which records its erection, " during the supremacy of the Śungas." [1] From the latter it may be gathered that the successors of Pushpamitra were more tolerant and liberal than him.

Next to Śunga, the Kānva dynasty came to power. They, too, were of the Brahmanical faith and continued for 45 years, from King Vasudeva (73 B. C.) to the last King Suśarman (28 B. C.) [2] Therefore, during the period extending from 185 B. C. to 28 B. C., Vedic Brāhmanism underwent a great revival in Central India. Not only that, it took great care to Brahmanise and re-shape many non-Bramanical systems of philosophy and religion. That precisely is why it became such a great movement.

This was undoubtedly a re-action of the powerful propaganda of Buddhism under the great royal support of King Aśoka

Now let us first of all see what was the condition of Hindu philosophy at that time. The so-called six systems of Hindu philosophy except the Nyāya system had formed their schools, in my opinion, during the period from the 3rd century B C. to the 1st century B. C. [3] and the Nyāya system, according to Dr. H. Ui and myself, formed its school sometime in the 2nd century A. D [4]

Among these schools, the Mīmāmsā and the Vedānta systems are only purely Vedic or Brāhmanic while the other systems, in my opinion, are not of a Vedic origin but

[1] A Guide to Sānchi, Sir John Marshall, p 10, 'Śunganam raje'

[2] Dynasties of the Kali Age of Pargiter, p 71

[3] This and allied points I will fully discuss when dealing with the Indian philosophy in future

[4] Dr H Ui's translation of Nyāyapraveśatarka-śāstra from Chinese to Japaneses, p. 46.

originally belonged, nevertheless, to Aryan thought outside the Vedic circle However, afterwards, these latter were Brāhmanized and regarded as pure Brāhmanical thought From Brāhmanical source as well as from Buddhist works we come to know that the six systems of Hindu philosophy were in a much flourishing condition at the time of the later Andhra and Gupta Kings That is exactly the time of Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva of Mādhyamika school, Maitreyanātha, Asanga and Vasubandhu of Yogācāra school. If we now look at Nāgārjuna's Daśabhūmi-vibhāsā-śāstra we find the names of Sāmkhya and Yoga mentioned,[1] and in his Ekaśloka-śāstra we meet the names of Kapila and Ulūka,[2] and in his Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra reference is made to the doctrines of the Sāmkhya system.[3] And in his Dvādaśamkāya-śāstra also we come across the term 'Satkārya' which indicates the doctrine of the Sāmkhya.[4]

Again, in the Satyasiddhi-śāstra of Harivarman who flourished about 260 or 280 A D. and was a later contemporary of Nāgārjuna. mention has been made of the Vaiśesika, the Sāmkhya and the Nyāya systems.[5]

In the Upāyakauśalyahridaya-śāstra which deals much with the Buddhist Nyāya system, the names of the Vaiśeṣika, the Sāmkhya, the Yoga as well as some other heritical schools are also found.[6] (Su Bundle, Vol. I, pp. 8*a*-13*b* of Chinese Tripiṭaka).

[1] Su Bundle, Vol 8, p 11*a* of Chinese Tripitaka

[2] Su Bundle, Vol I, p 5*a* of Chinese Tripitaka

[3] Wang Bundle, Vol 1, p 48*a* of Chinese Tripitaka

[4] Sai Bundle, Vol 10 p 67*b* of Chinese Tripitaka

[5] Chāng Bundle, Vol 2 p 117*b* and p 21*a* of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[6] This book which survives only in a Chinese translation is a very important Buddhist Śāstra regarding the development of Buddhist Nyāya In Chinese catalogues (see Nanjio's Catalogue, No 1257) this book is put under the authorship of Nāgārjuna but other catalogues like the Chinese Tripitaka of Ko-Kio-Sho In edition in Japan do not name any author at all My friend Dr H Ui in his introduction to a Japanese translation of a Chinese book called "Nyāyapraveśataraka-śāstra,

Besides these, in the śāstra by Āryadeva on "the refutation of four heretical and Hīnayāna schools mentioned in the Lankāvatāra sūtra" mention has been made of the names and doctrines of the Sāṁkhya and the Vaiśesika.[1] In his another work called "the explanation of Nirvāṇa by heretical and Hīnayāna schools mentioned in the Lankāvatāra-sūtra"[2] we also get the names of the Sāmkhya and the Vaiśeṣika among 20 other heretical schools,[3] and these are all refuted Again, if we turn to the works of the Yogācāra school, we will meet with refutations of the doctrines of the Sāṁkhya, the Vaiśesika and the Mīmāmsā with other 13 heretical schools in the Yogācāryabhūmi-Śāstra[4] by Māitreya-nātha.[5] The Prakaranāryavācā-śastra[6] of Asanga also refuted the doctrines of Sāmkhya and Vaiśesika, etc., and with it a refutation of 16 other heretical schools also has been made. In the life of Vasubandhu written by Paramārtha, we come to know that Vasubandhu wrote a book entitled 'Paramārthasaptatī' in opposition to the New Sāṁkhya śastra of Vindha-vāsa (or Īśvara-krisna)[7] a disciple of Varsagaṇya. We also know at the same time that King Vikramāditya was much satisfied with Vasubandhu on this occasion and gave him three lacs of

(pp 44 6) has satisfactorily shown from internal evidence that the author of the Upāyakauśalyahṛdaya śāstra was some Hīnayānist, the un-named author must be, as he says, a later contemporary or a nearer predecessor of Nāgārjuna.

[1] Su Bundle, Vol 5, p 56*a*, of Chinese Tripitaka

[2] Su Bundle, Vol 5, p 58*b*, of Chinese Tripitaka

[3] I have not yet identified those 20 heretical schools; therefore, I cannot mention those names here however, I will discuss this point on the subject "Heretical schools in India mentioned in the Buddhist books" in future

[4] Maitreyanātha, younger contemporary of Nāgārjuna, is the founder of Yogācara school and his date is about 270-350 A. D

[5] Lai Bundle, Vol 1 p 24*a* of Chinese Tripitaka

[6] Lai Bundle, Vol 7, p 35*b* (see Nanjio's catalogue no 1177)

[7] Dr. H Ui's article on the Sāmkhya system in the Journal of Philosophy, published by the department of *literature of Imperial University of* Tokyo No 379 University, p 1041 (1920).

gold; moreover, the king also sent his queen with the crown prince Bālāditya to study Buddhism under the celebrated Vasubandhu.[1] Again in Buddhagotra-śāstra of Vasubandhu, we meet with refutations of the Sāmkhya, and the Vaiśesika doctrines.[2]

Thus the systems of Sāmkhya, Vaiśesika, Yoga, and Nyāya as well as the treatises of Mīmāmsā, and of many other heretical schools were undoubtedly in a flourishing condition in those times. Therefore it was, that Nāgārjuna and his disciple Āryadeva were busily engaged in refuting the Vedic Brāhmanic ideas and un-Vedic Aryan doctrines (Brāhmanised). Next let us see what was then the condition of different religious faiths at the time of Nāgārjuna. From numismatic and epigraphic evidence as well as from various Hindu literatures, we come to know that the popular Hindu religions which are known under the names of Vaisṇavism, Śaivism and Śāktism were in a very flourishing condition in the time of Nāgārjuna.

To my opinion, these are, also, not of Vedic origin, but originally belonged to the religious ideas of Outlandic Indo-Aryans about which we are going to discuss below. However, I think that the great Buddhist propaganda under king Aśoka led the Vedic priests to Brāhmanise the religious ideas of Outlandic Indo-Aryans in order to start a counter-movement against it. Now let us see how these religions came into being.

(*a*) *Vaisnavism.*—This is sometimes, known under the name of Bhāgavata religion, or Sātvata religion or Ekāntika Dharma and sometimes as Pañcharātra religion. This religion has a variety of names but it is essentially a religion of Bhakti or Love and Faith. It was originally

[1] See my *Shifting of Centres of Buddhism in India*, Journal of Letters Calcutta Univ, Vol I

[2] Su Bundle, Vol. 2, pp 75*b*-79*b* of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

the worship of Vāsudeva or Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa of the Sātvata race. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar said of this faith in his Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism —

"The Ksatriyas engaged themselves in active speculations on religious matters about the time of the Upaniṣads and are mentioned even as the original possessors of the new knowledge. Siddhārtha and Mahāvīra founded in this period of intellectual fermentation new systems of religion in the east or the Magadha country which discarded or passed over in silence the doctrine of the existence even of God and laid down self-abnegation and a course of strict moral conduct as the way to salvation. They belonged to the Śākya and Jñātrka race of Ksatriyas, and Buddhism and Jainism might be considered to be the religions of those tribes. The West, however, was not so radical in its speculations, and the race of Sātvatas developed a system of religion which took up the ideas of a supreme God and devotion to him as the mode of salvation"[1]

This worship of Vāsudeva-Kṛsna seems clearly to be alluded to by Megasthenes, who was the Macedonian ambassador at the court of Chandragupta, the Maurya. Chandragupta reigned in the last quarter of the fourth century B. C. And if the Vāsudeva-Kṛṣna worship prevailed in the time of the first Maurya, it must have originated long before the establishment of Maurya dynasty.[2] At the same time the Pāṇini sūtras (IV. 3. 95 and IV. 3. 98) mention the name of Vāsudeva as 'worshipful' and from these we learn that this Bhakti religion must have arisen before this time,[3] and the date

[1] Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's Vaisnavism Śaivism, etc, p 9

[2] *Ibid*, p 9

[3] *Ibid*, p 3, and Dr Hemchandra Raychaudhuri's Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect, p 14, and p 18

of Pāṇini, according to the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, is between 425 and 325 B. C.[1]

As you know, the founder of this religion is a scion of the Vṛṣṇi or Sātvata branch of the Yādava clan which was originally settled in Saurāstra or the Kāthiāwad Peninsula and then spread to Mathurā.[2] According to Baudhāyana's Dharmasūtra (I. I. 32-33) .—

"The inhabitants of Ānartta, of Anga, of Magadha, of Saurāstra, of the Deccan, of Upavrit, of Sind, and the Sauvīras are of mixed origin. He who has visited the (countries of the) Ārattas, Kāraskaras, Pundras, Sauvīras, Vangas, Kalingas, (or) Pranunas shall offer a Punastoma or Sarvaprsthi."

Another law-giver, Devala (as quoted by Vijñāneśvara or Yājñavalkya III, 292), says. —

"He who has visited the (countries of the) Sindhus, Sauvīras, Saurāstras, inhabitants of the frontier regions, of the Angas, Vangas, Kalingas, and Andhras, should go through the ceremony of initiation anew"[3]

Therefore, the country of Saurāstra belonged to the Outlandic Indo-Aryan as has been pointed out by Mr. Ramāprasād Chanda clearly in his learned work.[4] So from ethnological point of view, the religion of Bhakti, the worship of Vāsudeva originally belonged to the culture not of the Vedic Aryan but of the Outlandic Indo-Aryans. Such un-Vedic, non-Brāhmanical Vāsudeva, however, later on, was identified with Nārāyana-Visnu a Vedic God. This identification we find for the first time in the Taittirīya Āranyaka[5] (X. I. 6). And according to Dr. Keith, the said Āranyaka probably dates from the

[1] J B O R S, Vol VI, Part I, 1920, p 29 by M M H P Sāstri
[2] The Indo-Aryan Races by Mr Ramāprasād Chanda, B A, p 101
[3] I have quoted from *Ibid*, p. 40
[4] *Ibid*, pp 40-41
[5] Dr Hemchandra Raychaudhuri's Early History of the Vaiṣṇava, Sect, p. 63

third century B. C.[1] So we see the appearance of Vāsudeva as a name of Nārāyaṇa-Visṇu in a Brāhmanical work of the third century B. C. is very significant. Hence the un-Vedic and non-Brāhmanic Bhakti religion was Brāhmanized later on. As has been said before, this was due to the strong active propaganda of Buddhism under king Aśoka which led the Vedic Aryans to Brāhmanize such un-Vedic religious ideas.[2] This is the real meaning of this Vedic religious revival.

From the Ghasundi and Besnagar inscriptions dated second century B C,[3] we come to learn that at this time the Bhāgavata religion had overstepped the boundaries of the Mathurā region and spread to the Indian border-land and that its fame had reached the ears of non-Indian peoples some of whom became converts to the faith.[4] Not only that,—one of the kings of the Kushāna dynasty was actually called Vāsudeva I, who succeeded Huvishka. According to my opinion Vāsudeva's date is about 10 A. D. His name, as Mr. V. A. Smith said,[5] is thoroughly Indian, a synonym for Visnu, and it is a proof of the rapidity with which the foreign invaders had succumbed to the influence of their environment, though the kings of Kushāna dynasty were anti-Bhāgavata at first. It seems then that this faith spread all over Northern India at the time. At the time of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva this religion was one of those many schools which they strongly condemned and rejected. Therefore, we find the Vaiṣnavism mentioned in Āryadeva's work[6] under

[1] J R A S, 1915, p 840

[2] I am very glad to find that Dr Hemchandra Raychaudhuri also holds the same opinion regarding this point in his learned work referred to above

[3] Sir R G Bhandarkar's Vaisnavism, Śaivism etc, pp 3 4

[4] Dr. Hemchandra Raychaudhuri's Early History of Vaiṣnava Sect, p 57

[5] Early History of India, 3rd edition, p 272

[6] "Sūtra by Āryadeva on the explanation of the Nirvāṇa by Heretical and Hinayāna schools mentioned in the Lankāvatāra-sūtra" (see Nanjio's Catalogue No. 1260) in the Su Bundle Vol 5, pp 58b-59b of Chinese Tripitaka

the name of the 'doctrine of Māṭhara' which is the twefīth of the twenty heretical schools.

It will be very interesting to state here that the above-mentioned Māṭhara was one of the ministers of king Kaniska II (about 140 A. D.), and at the same time from other source we know that he was one of the great Sāmkhya philosophers From the reference in Āryadeva's book we can very well conclude that his doctrines on the Sāmkhya had Vaisnavistic tendencies and tinges. In the Gupta period this Vaisnava religion was flourishing in the Panjab, Rājputānā, Central India and Magadha.

The Gupta sovereigns of Magadha describe themselves as 'Paramabhāgavata'[1] and were unquestionably great champions of the religion of Vāsudeva, though some of them were Buddhist in faith. Thus we see at the time of Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Maitreyanātha, Asanga and Vasubandhu, this popular Brāhmanized religion called Vaisnavism was in a very flourishing condition almost throughout the whole of Northern India

(*b*) *Śaivism*.—This is one of the principal popular religions of the Hindus, and this faith was in a very flourishing condition at the time of Nāgārjuna Let us, now, first see whether this religion originally belonged to Brāhmanic or non-Brāhmanic fold, so that we may understand how this religious movement came into being and became so powerful. In my opinion, this religion originally belonged to the un-Vedic or Outlandic Indo-Aryan faith. There are so many deities in the Ṛg-Veda · Agni, Vāyu, Varuna, Indra, Sūrya, Savitā, Rudra and the Maruts (often called Rudras) and others but Śiva is nowhere mentioned.[2] Of course, a word 'Śiva' occurs

[1] The Early History of Vaiṣṇava Sect, by Dr. Hemchandra Raychaudhury, p. 101.
[2] Macdonell's Vedic Mythology, p 75

in the Rg-Veda (10. 92), but it was only as an auspicious name of Rudra and not of any independent deity. According to the prevailing notion Vedic Rudra is identified with Śiva.

But if we compare the physical features of Rudra in the Ṛg-Veda with those of Śiva which were described in the later Hindu Mythology, we will come to know that they are totally different deities In the Rg-Veda, Rudra is thus described · "He has a hand, arms, and firm limbs. He has beautiful lips and wears braided hair. His colour is brown. His shape is dazzling, and he is multiform He shines like the brilliant sun, like gold. He is arrayed with golden ornaments and wears a glorious multiform necklace. He sits on a car-seat."[1]

On the other hand, Śiva is described in the Bhāgavata Purāna, which follows the Epic tradition, as "an impure and proud demolisher of rites, as roaming about in cemeteries attended by hosts of ghosts and spirits, as like a madman, naked, with dishevelled hair, as laughing and weeping, as smeared with ashes from funeral pyres, as wearing a garland of dead men's skulls, pretending to be Śiva 'auspicious' but being in reality Aśiva 'inauspicious' as insane and lord of bhūtas."[2] Regarding this point M. M. H. P Śāstri said in his Annual Address in the Asiatic Society of Bengal "Is Rudra really our Śiva? The two may be identical in some of the aspects, but in the majority of aspects they differ. The Rudra worship in the Sāmaveda Sandhyā describes him as :—

ऋतं सत्यं परं ब्रह्म पुरुषं कृष्णपिङ्गलम् ।
ऊर्द्ध्वलिङ्गं विरूपाक्षं विश्वरूपं नमोनमः ॥

"He is the reality. He is the truth. He is Supreme Brahman. He is Puruṣa. He is black and brown. He

[1] Macdonell's Vedic Mythology, p 74
[2] E R E Vol 11, p 91

belongs to the Upper region. He has abnormal eyes and pervades the Universe." But the later conception,

ध्यायेन्नित्यं महेशं रजतगिरिनिभं चारुचन्द्रावतंसम्,
रत्नाकल्पोज्ज्वलाङ्गं परशुमृगवराभीतिहस्तं प्रसन्नम् ।
पद्मासीनं समन्तात्स्तुतममरगणैर्व्याघ्रकृत्तिं वसानं
विश्वाद्यं विश्ववीजं निखिलभयहरं पञ्चवक्त्रं त्रिनेत्रम् ॥

"Śiva is like a silver-mountain, moon-crested, with limbs brilliant with the radiance of a variety of precious stones, with four hands holding axe, mṛga, boon-pose, no-fear pose, with a smiling benevolent look, seated on a lotus throne, propitiated with hymns by deities on all sides, with five heads and three eyes, clothed in a tiger-skin, and the beginning and the seed of the Universe." The conceptions materially differ.[1]

Thus the physical features as well as the conception of Rudra and Śiva differ from each other. Who is then Śiva? Who possessed forty-eight different names and eight different Mūrtis? In the Yajur-Veda (T. S IV. 5, 1. VS. chapter 16) Rudra has been given different epithets from that of the Ṛg-Veda. He is called Giriśa, Giritra, Pasupati, Kapardin, Ugra, Bhīma, Bhiṣaja, Śarva, Bhava, Śambhu, Śamkara, Śiva, Sitikanṭha, Nilagrīva, etc.[2] And in another place in the same book Rudras are called Ganas, Gaṇapatis, and Nisādas.'[3] Here we find different names of Śiva in accordance with his representation.

Out of forty-eight names of Śiva some occur here. And at the same time we also find here five or six of his

[1] J A S B., Vol. XVII, 1921 No 2, pp. xx-xxi.

[2] Bengali Visvakoṣa, Vol. XX, p. 822, and Sir R G Bhandarkar's Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism, etc., p 103

[3] *Ibid*, p 104.

Mūrtis out of eight.[1] Therefore, Dr. Macdonell said in his Sanskrit Literature :—

"The Rudra of the Rg-Veda has begun to appear on the scene as Śiva, being several times mentioned by that name as well as other epithets later peculiar to Śiva, such as Śankara and Mahādeva."[2]

However, our question "Who is Śiva?" is still remaining obscure. Of the above-mentioned names 'Giriśa and Giritra' lying on a mountain, 'Paśupati' lord of cattle, 'Gaṇas' tribes, 'Ganapatis' leaders of tribes, workmen, potters, cart-makers, carpenters, and 'Nisādas' the forest tribes, seem to suggest that at the time of the Yajur-Veda certain peculiar gods of forest-tribes came to be connected with Rudra. In this connection R. G. Bhandarkar says —

"Thus these followers of handicraft and also the forest-tribe of Nisādas are brought into close connection with Rudra. Probably they were his worshippers, or their own peculiar gods were identified with the Aryan-Rudra."[3]

Therefore, it is reasonable to think that the god Śiva was originally a name of a particular deity of forest-tribes as mentioned above with many peculiar epithets and the said five Mūrtis. I think this is the reason why he has been known as the lord of Pārvati whom we know under the name of Kāli or Dūrga She too originally belonged to savage tribes which we are going to discuss under the next section. In the intervening period between the time of the Yajur-Veda and the Atharva-Veda, the eight Mūrtis of Śiva came into being in a complete form. But still it is a very curious fact, that in the Vrātya book of the Atharva-Veda (XV. 5, 1-7), we find eight Mūrtis of Śiva

[1] Eight Mūrtis are Bhava, Sarva, Paśupati, Rudra, Ugra Mahādeva, Iśāna Bhīma

[2] P 181, and Vedic Mythology, p 4, and Hopkin's Religions of India, p 178

[3] Vaiṣnavism, Śaivism, etc p 104

except 'Bhīma.' Sir R. G. Bhandarkar wrote on this point in the following way without any special note :— "The gods made Bhava the archer, the protector of the Vrātyas, or outcasts, in the intermediate space of the eastern region, Śarva of the southern region, Paśupati of the western region, Ugra of the northern region, Rudra of the lower region, Mahādeva of the upper region, and Īśāna of all the intermediate regions."[1] But MM. H. P. Śāstri expressed his opinion on this point recently in his Annual address in the Asiatic Society of Bengal :—

"The general notion was that it was meant to be a glorification of the Vrātyas But it is not known whether they were still then in nomad life or settled. But reading the chapter over and over again I found that the Vrātyas induced the creator to look within himself, and he saw Suvarna, brilliance. That brilliance increased and grew up, and it became Īśāna, it became Mahādeva, it became Ekavrātya or the totality of the Vrātya community, in other words, the spirit of the Vrātya community, the god of the Vrātya community...... So the chapter is not exactly the glorification of the Vrātyas, but of their spirit, of their god whom they had lost, as stated in the Brāhmana of the Sāma-Veda. The Maruts instructed them in the Sāmans, the recital of which re-united them with their god and purified them for entrance into the Vedic community. This idea struck me and I read the chapter again and again with increasing interest, eagerness and enthusiasm. And wonder of wonders! I found my Śiva there. He is Īśāna, he is Mahādeva."[2]

And again he said :—

"But the most striking and convincing clue to the identification is given in the fifth paragraph of the same

[1] Vaiṣnavism, Śaivism and etc, p 105

[2] J A S B, Vol XVII, 1921, p xvii.

chapter. The eastern quarter from the Antaradeśa gave him Bhava as his servitor, the southern quarter from the same Antaradeśa gave him Sarva, the western quarter gave him Paśupati, the northern quarter gave him Ugra, the Dhruva gave him Rudra, upper regions gave him Mahādeva and the whole of the Antaradeśa gave him Īśana. Here we get the seven of the eight Mūrtis of Śiva."[1]

And he said in conclusion that Śiva was the god of nomad Vrātya or spirit of Vrātya. This new investigation of his itself gives some light on the subject. But his explanations as well as his view, seem to me to be partially right. Practically the seven Mūrtis of Śiva in the Vrātya book of Atharva-Veda as has been said by MM. H. P. Śāstri open a new debate before us. But already before the Atharva-Veda we find in the Vājasaṇeya Saṁhita itself five of the seven Mūrtis of Śiva as I have stated before. But we should admit that there is a close connection between Śiva and the spirit of Vrātyas. In my opinion, originally Śiva was the name of a peculiar god of the Nisadas or forest-tribes. But afterwards, he was brought into close connection with Rudra of the Aryans and identified with the latter by the Vedic Aryans in the time of the Yajur-Veda. This is the reason why we find many names of Śiva as a characteristic of forest god in the Vājasaṇeya Saṁhitā, and why again Rudra of the Rg-Veda began to appear on the scene as Śiva in the Vājasaneya Saṁhitā. And simultaneously with this, in the end of the Yajur-Veda as a whole and in the time of the Atharva-Veda, the Vrātyas or the Outlandic Indo-Aryans, took the Mūrtis of Śiva and engrafted them on their own god, in order to heighten his glory. Here a question may arise why

[1] J A S B, Vol XVII, 1921, p xxiii.

Vrātyas manifested their god under the name or Mūrtis of the forest god of Nisāda without taking any from the Vedic Aryan Pantheon? The reason of it probably is that the Vrātyas being Aryans outside Vedic Circle always fought against the Vedic Aryans. Therefore, their sympathy naturally tended towards other tribes besides the Vedic Aryans. We know that it is always an admitted human trait to adopt and import ideas from the quarter of our sympathisers. Fortunately for them they found the auspicious name Śiva and his Mūrtis among the Nisādas engrafted on their own god and glory of their spirit.

Thus the god Śiva originally belonging to the forest tribes or Nisādas was then connected with the spirit of the Vrātyas, the outlandic Indo-Aryans. Therefore, the so-called Śaivism was a combination, a dual element of worship. And this religious movement was afterwards Brāhmanised by the Vedic Aryan priests in order to encounter the rather strong Buddhist movement at the time of King Aśoka. This ultimately Brāhmanized god Śiva was widely worshipped in India at the beginning of the Christian era. Vāsudeva I (about 10 A. D.) and Wema-kadphises (about 75 A. D.), both powerful princes of the Kusāna dynasty, who ruled over a large part of Northern and North-Western India, styled themselves on the reverse of their coins as devotees of Maheśvara, or Śiva. The author of Amarakosa gives forty-eight names of Śiva, showing thereby how widely the worship of the god prevailed in India in the early centuries of the Christian era. This Śaivism is also referred to in Āryadeva's work. There we get Śaivism under the name of Īśāna and Maheśvara as the 5th and the 15th among the twenty heretical sets of doctrines. This clearly shows that the Śaivism was a powerful religious movement at the time of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva.

Therefore, obviously it was one of the butts of attack for the Buddhist at that time.

(c) *Śāktism.*—Like Viṣṇu and Śiva, the worship of Śakti or the active female principle as manifested in the form of the consort of Śiva is occupying a very prominent position among the Hindus as one of the popular religions.

Śakti or Devī is known by different names: Ambikā, Durgā, Umā, Kātyāyanī, Bhadrakālī, etc. Among these, Ambikā, Durgā, Umā are very famous epithets of the Devī. But the name Durgā is the most predominant one.

In the Mahābhārata (Bhīsmaparva, chap. 23), there is a hymn addressed to Durgā by Arjuna under the advice of Kṛṣṇa in which she is prayed for granting victory in the forthcoming battle. This hymn itself shows that at the time when it was composed and inserted in the poem, Durgā had already acquired such importance that she was adored by men as a powerful goddess, able to fulfil their desires. Of the names by which she is addressed we get the following Kumārī (maiden), Kāli (black or female time as destroyer), Kāpālī (wearer of skulls), Mahākālī (the great destroyer), Caṇḍī (angry), Kātyāyanī (of the Kātya family), Karālā (frightful), Vijayā (victory), Kauśikī (of the Kuśika family), Umā, Kāntāravāsinī (dwelling in the forest).[1] These names are, methinks, nothing but personifications of different attributes of Devī or Durgā. Let us examine the history of some of these names like Durgā, Umā, and Ambikā.

Umā.—In the Kena Upanishada (III. 25) Umā is said to be the daughter of Himavat. Prof. Jacobi writes about Umā, thus:—" Apparently she was originally an independent goddess, or at least a kind of divine being,

[1] Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism etc., pp. 142-143.

perhaps a female mountain ghost haunting the Himālaya and was later identified with Rudra's (Śiva) wife."[1] Mr. Ramāprasāda Chanda writes thus:—" the epithet 'Haimavàtī' or daughter of 'Himavat' indicates that the goddess Umā was originally worshipped by the dwellers in the Himālaya region."[2]

Durgā.—Though she is mentioned in the Taittirīya Āranyaka (XI) as the daughter of the sun or fire, however, in the Mahābhārata (Harivamsa, V. 3274) she has been mentioned as a Vindhya-Vāsinī. Prof. Jacobi writes: " A similar mountain-goddess had her home in the Vindhyas. She was of a cruel character, as might be expected from a goddess of the savage tribes living in those hills. Her name is Vindhya-Vāsinī, and she too is identified with Siva's wife."[3] In a hymn to the goddess given in the Harivaṁsa (59, 3234) it is said of her, " You are worshipped by the Śavaras, barbarous (savages), and Pulindas." This clearly shows that Durgā was originally worshipped by those savage tribes of the Vindhya region.[4]

Ambikā.—In the post-Vedic period, that is to say in the Taittirīya Āranyaka (X. 18), Ambikā is mentioned as Śiva's wife, but in the Vājasaneya Sanhitā (3,5), she is said to be mentioned as Rudra's sister.[5] From what has been said, at any rate, it can scarcely be doubted that those mountain goddesses or savage goddesses from different parts of West, North and East India, and those which were worshipped by different classes of un-Vedic people from the time of Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (which

[1] E R E, Vol 2, p 813*a*
[2] Indo-Aryan Races, p 128
[3] E R E, Vol 2, p 813*a*
[4] Sir R G Bhandarkar's Vaiṣnavism, Śaivism, etc., p 143.
[5] Vedic Mythology of Macdonell, p 74

probably dated from the third century B. C. according to Keith)[1] and onward, in course of time, were combined and unified with the Vedic female goddess Ambikā, the sister of Rudra and these two together became the wives of Śiva, when Śiva, the god of the Nisāda or the spirit of the Vrātyas, was identified with Vedic Rudra in the time of Yajur-Veda and Atharva-Veda (in the 15th chapter). Here a question naturally suggests itself how such goddesses worshipped by different classes of people were identified with Ambikā and all together crystallized into the Devī or Śakti of Śiva? In answer to this question, I may quote Mr. Ramāprasāda Chanda's explanation :—

"The Śākti conception of the Devi or Ādyā Śākti 'The primordial energy' and Jagadambā, 'The mother of the Universe' also very probably arose in a society where matriarchate or mother-kin was prevalent. The most important question in connection with Śāktism is, among what division of the Indian people did it originate? A Sanskrit stanza in anustup metre recited by the Śākta panditas of Bengal affords the traditional answer to this question. In this stanza we are told :—'The cult (Vidyā) was revealed in Gauda (Bengal), popularised (prabalīkṛtā, *lit.* 'strengthened') by the Maithilas, it here and there prevails in Mahārāṣtra, and has disappeared in Gujrāt.'[2] Bengal is still the stronghold of Śāktism, and there are Śāktas in Mithilā (North Bihar), the Marāṭhā country and Gujrāt. Here, with the questionable exception of Mithilā, all other countries belong to the outer Indo-Aryan belt. Did Śāktism then originate among the Indo-Aryans of the outer countries? If evidences were forthcoming to prove

[1] J R. A S, 1915, p 810.

[2] "गौडे प्रकाशिता विद्या मैथिले प्रबलीकृता।
क्वचित् क्वचिन् महाराष्ट्रे गुर्ज्जरे प्रलयं गता॥

that mother-kin at one time prevailed among them, the traditional view regarding the origin of Śāktism, could be accepted as a working hypothesis....... From these (Mahābhārata and Dasarathajātaka as well as Mahāvaṃśa) evidences we may infer that mother-kin was at one time universal among the Indo-Aryans of outer belt and led to the growth of Śāktism among them."[1]

Āryadeva mentioned a Śakti doctrine as the 9th among the twenty heretical sets of doctrines in his work which I have mentioned already. At present, I am not in a position to identify this with the so-called Śakti of Durgā or Devī worship. However, it is beyond doubt that Śāktism was prevailing at the time of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva and that also became one of the objects of attack by the Buddhists at the time.

The main Purānas which cover generally the time from Āpastamba-Dharma-śāstra (which is not later than the third century B. C.)[2] to the Gupta age (3rd and 4th centuries A. D.), much helped to further the above-mentioned popular religious movements. Not only that, the Purāṇas themselves created other new popular faiths like the worship of ten incarnations of Visṇu, Gopāla Krisṇa and allied Paurānic faiths during the period covering from the time of Nāgārjuna to Vasubandhu.

I have given above almost a full account of the philosophical and religious condition of India at the time of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva respectively. Of these two-fold aspects—philosophical and religious, the former may be termed the theoretical side which none but advanced men (constituting the high intellectual social class) could accept but the latter was the popular religion proper, propounded for the acceptance and benefit of the masses

[1] Indo-Aryan Races, pp 153-156

[2] Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect by Dr Hemchandra Raychaudhuri, p 90

or common people. The time required the meeting of both these demands by any movement which wanted to establish a firm hold over the country. Nāgārjuna understood the situation aright and consequently systematized a Buddhist philosophy on the one hand and established the so-called 'Sahaja-mārga' on the other, as auxiliary religious practices.

At the time of Asanga and Vasubandhu (about 310 or 320-400 A. D.) the 'Sahaja-mārga' inculcating a recital of Buddha's names was prevailing in the Buddhist community in a much more preponderate condition than that of Nāgārjuna. For, at the time of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu, the Nāma-vāda and other allied religious practices were prevailing not only among the common mass but also among highly advanced people. From this the reader should not suppose that in the Buddhist community at that time there were no followers of the Kathina-mārga. Therefore, Asanga stated in his Mahāyānasamparigra-ha-Śāstra thus :—

"If any one recite the name of Prabhuta-ratna Buddha, thereby he will obtain the supreme perfect Enlightenment."[1]

Again, in the Mahāyāna-Sūtrālankāra-Śāstra-kārikā, we meet with the following statement :—

"In order to destroy the indolence, Mahāyāna sūtra speaks that, if any one pray to be born in the Sukhāvatī (pure-land), he will certainly be born there. And if any one who reciting even the name of Tathāgata-Vimalacandraprabha he will certainly obtain perfect Enlightenment."[2]

[1] Lai Bundle, Vol. 9, p 69*a* of Chinese Tiipiṭaka (see Nanjio's catalogue No 1183)

[2] कौसीद्यावरणस्य प्रतिपक्षसंभाषः । ये सुखावत्यां प्रणिधानं करिष्यन्ति ते तत्रोपपत्स्यन्त इति । विमलचन्द्रप्रभस्य च तथागतस्य नामधेयग्रहणमात्रेण नियतो भवत्यनुत्तरायां सम्यक्संबोधाविति ।
(Edited by Dr S Lévi, p 83)

The same idea is found, again in his **Mahāyānābhidharma-sangiti-Śāstra.**[1]

Next let us see what was the corresponding condition at the time of Aśvaghoṣa II (probably former part of the 5th century A. D.). In the Mahāyāna-śradhotpāda-śāstra he stated thus :—

"Therefore, it is advisable for those novices to cherish this thought: All Buddhas and Bodhisattvas in the ten quarters having great, unimpeded supernatural powers (abhijñā), are able to emancipate all suffering beings by means of various expediencies that are good and excellent (upāyakauśalya).

"After this reflexion, they should make great vows (mahāpranidhāna), and with full concentration of spiritual powers think of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, when they have such a firm conviction, free from all doubts, they will assuredly be able to be born in the Buddha-country beyond (buddha-kshetra), when they pass away from this present life, and seeing there Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, to complete their faith and to eternally escape from all evil creations (apāya). Therefore, it is said in the Sūtra that if devoted men and women be filled with concentration of thought, think of Amitābha Buddha in the world of highest happiness (sukhāvatī) in the Western region, and direct (parināma) all the root of their good work towards being born there, they would assuredly be born there.

"Thus always seeing Buddhas there, their faith will be strengthened, and they will never relapse therefrom. Receiving instruction in the doctrine, and recognising the Dharmakāya of the Buddha, they will by gradual

[1] Lai Bundle, Vol. 8, p 77*a* of Chinese Tripiṭaka (see also Nanjio's catalogue, No 264)

discipline be able to enter upon the state of truth (*i.e.*, Buddhahood)."[1]

In the above statement we should mark one thing that at the time of Nāgārjuna as well as Asanga and Vasubandhu, the 'Sahaja-mārga' was simply reciting the name of any Buddha But in the time of Aśvaghoṣa II, the 'Sahaja-mārga' was not simply reciting the name of any Buddha but limited to the name of Amitābha-Buddha only. This fact can be proved even from Archæological evidence. Because, we find many images of Amitābha-Buddha in the Buddhist sculpture specially in the Gupta period A tendency of the worship of Amitābha-Buddha or reciting the name of him was existing even in the time of Asanga and Vasubandhu as an adjunct of the 'Sahaja-mārga.' But it was only at the time of Aśvaghosa II and later on, that 'Sahaja-mārga' exclusively came to include only the reciting of the name of Amitābha-Buddha

The great Chinese teacher of Amitābha sect, Tshz'-ming some time called Hui-zih, met with Itsing as soon as he had gone back to China from India, and Tshz' ming determined to come to India. So he started from China in 702 A. D. by sea and after passing Kun-lun (Siam and states of the Peninsula of Malacca), Fo-shi (modern Palambang, the north-eastern coast of Sumatra)[2] and finally Ceylon after three years he arrived in India. He lived 13 years in India. During this time he asked many teachers many times such questions as "By what form of Buddhism and by what kind of practice one can obtain salvation?" From every quarter he received the same answer, *viz*, worship the Amitābha-Buddha and

[1] Awakening of Faith by T. Suzuki, pp 144-146

[2] J. Takakus's I Tsing, p 1, and Chan-Ju-kuo by F Hirth and W. W. Rockkill, p. 63.

you go to Sukhāvati.[1] This piece of information clearly shows that the worship of Amitābha-Buddha or reciting his name strongly prevailed in India at that time.

To conclude, in the above, our aim has been to present a historical account of the terms 'Sahaja-mārga' and 'Kathina-mārga' in Buddhism and at the same time specially we have noted the particular form of Buddhist religion known as 'Sahaja-mārga' was decidedly the result of under the great influence of popular Hindu faiths from the time of Nāgārjuna onwards.

Let us at the end of this introduction summarize, in charts, different terms already dealt with.

		Buddhism		
1	Geographical division	Northern Buddhism		Southern Buddhism
2	Doctrinal division	Mahāyāna	Hīnayāna	Hīnayāna
3	Division from the way of Buddha's preaching	Guhyayāna	Vyaktayana	Vyaktayāna
4	Division from a practical point of view	Sahajayāna	Katḥinayāna	Katḥinayāna

Chih Bundle, Vol 5, p 103b.a

PART I

CHAPTER I

I.—The Significance of the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna.

From the etymological point of view, 'Mahāyāna' means Great Vehicle, and 'Hīnayāna' means small Vehicle. Now, as you know, 'Yāna' (or Vehicle) implies at least two things, one, the Vehicle itself and secondly, the traveller who uses the Vehicle to go from place to place. From the religious standpoint, 'Yāna' (or Vehicle) itself indicates doctrines, while the figure of the traveller suggests the religieux. Again, the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' in relation with one another, have the implication of superiority and inferiority, praise and depreciation; in other words, the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' suggest some rivalry between the two schools, and the word 'Mahā' or Great is used by way of striking a note of superiority and praise of one school over the contending school, Hīnayāna,—as 'Hīna' means small, and implies inferiority and depreciation. So these terms imply naturally superiority and inferiority respectively of the doctrines on the one hand and the religieux on the other. If we further particularly amplify these two points, then the 'Doctrines' will resolve themselves into two features, one is the 'Teaching' and another the 'Doctrinal idea'; the former aspect at present stands in the 'Sūtra-form' as record in which doctrinal ideas have

been embodied and the latter is the 'Doctrine' (the dharma) itself; again the 'Religieux' also will resolve itself into two features; one is the 'Religious practices' and the other is 'Salvation.' Therefore, the *terms* 'Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna' naturally indicate a relation of superiority and inferiority on those four points

Among Buddhist scholars there is a good deal of divergence of opinion as to the conception of the terms 'Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna'; for example, among our Japanese Buddhist scholars, Dr. Eyun Mayeda, holds that the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' imply a particular relation on the point of 'Religieux' only but definitely not on that of the 'Doctrinal,'[1] while there are others who hold quite a contrary view. But to me the terms indicate both the features, the point of the religieux and the point of the doctrine. And that is precisely why in the Mahāyāna sūtras and śastras we find many other terms like 'Ekayāna,' 'Dviyāna,' 'Buddhayāna,' and 'Bodhisattvayāna.' When the necessity has been to show a doctrinal relation, then the terms 'Ekayāna' and 'Dviyāna' have been used in the place of 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' and while the religieux is implied, the terms 'Buddhayāna,' or 'Bodhisattvayāna' and 'Arhatyāna,' or 'Śrāvakayāna' have been applied in the place of 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' respectively. All these points will be made clear in course of the subsequent chapters.

II.—Interrelation underlying between the two terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna as regards subject matter indicated by them.

In the previous section, I have already dealt with the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' so far as they indicate a mutual relation of two things in the sense of superiority

[1] In his Historical Discourse on Mahāyāna Buddhism, p 117 121 (In Japanese)

and inferiority, praise and depreciation. At present, our duty is to ascertain the interrelation as regards subject matters indicated by these two terms, and at the same time to try to hit at the right stand-point which can possibly evoke a conception of superiority and inferiority, etc. I should like to say at once that the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna are nothing but expressions' a relation between two aspects of Buddha's perception. This point I had the occasion to explicitly discuss in my paper 'What is Buddhism?'[1] However, for a right understanding of our present subject matter a short re-statement of the same will be necessary.

When Buddha attained Enlightenment under the Bodhi-tree, he understood the reality of this world in two-fold aspect, *viz* :—(*i*) the peaceful real state of the internal world, (*ii*) the sorrowful apparent state of this world. There he obtained two different perceptions:—(*i*) The transcendental truth of the world, and (*ii*) the truth of the apparent world In other words, when Buddha looked to this world from his enlightened stand point, he at once had a penetration first into the real state of this phenomenal, outward 'Samsāra,' the chain of cause and effect, and then an introspection to the reality of the internal world, and the way to realize the same.

From the stand-point of Buddha's perception, the former is 'Phenomenological' and the latter is 'Ontological;' also the former became 'The Doctrine which he preached only according to people's requirements;' while the latter is 'The Doctrine which expressed his own self-introspectional perception;' again the former became 'The Exoteric Doctrine (vyaktopadeśa)' and the latter 'The Esoteric Doctrine (guhyopadeśa).' From the historical point of view again, the former became the

[1] Published in the Journal of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol IV.

'Original Buddhism,' while the latter, the 'Developed Buddhism.' All these will be clear from the following explanation.

From history of Buddhism in India, we know that, after Buddha obtained perfect Enlightenment, he began to preach for the salvation of all human beings. To carry out his purpose, after due deliberation[1] he preached for the pretty long period of 45 years (530 B.C.—486 B.C.), beginning from the first sermon at the Deer-Park near Benāres, known as Dhammacakka-pavattna-sutta (the sūtra of the Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness), and ending with the teaching embodied in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta at Kusinārā During these years, as far as history records, he preached and explained only his doctrine of Phenomenological perceptions with the 'Four-Noble-Truths' (catvāri-ārya-satyāni) as its basis, namely (*1*) 'Suffering' (duḥkha) by which he used to explain the question of 'what' of the apparent world, (*2*) 'Its cause' (duhkha-samudaya by which he used to answer the question of 'Why' 'How' of the same 'Saṁsāra,' (*3*) 'Suppression' (duḥkha-nirodha) and (*4*) 'The path leading to its final extinction (duḥkha-nirodha-mārga). Besides these, we have two other formulæ embodying Buddha's instruction: (*i*) The three-fold corner stone of Buddhism, namely 'All is impermanent,' (sarvam-anityam), 'All is suffering' (sarvam-duḥkhaṁ) and 'All is without self' (sarvaṁ-anātmam). (*ii*) The famous term 'twelve-linked chain of causation' (dvādasa-pratītya-samutpāda). The former is minute explanation of 'Duḥkha' and the latter is a

[1] The tradition of seven weeks' deliberation after the enlightenment is most satisfactorily explained by the supposition that he was considering carefully the age, the country and the capacity of the ordinary people to whom he would have to minister, and then the best form of presenting the Truth so that all may appreciate Another reason may be, as has been suggested by *others, that he did not* find at once the necessary type of disciples who would receive his teachings

minute statement of 'Duḥkha-samudaya.' However, the fact that occurs to us is that all throughout his life the Buddha never preached his Introspectional Ontological Doctrine explicitly. The reason of this, in my opinion, is that he always considered the capacity and the necessity of the people around him, so that he preached whatever were useful and apt to suit the particular condition and environment, religious, philosophical, and social, of that age. We should not forget the most important feature of Buddha's preaching, that he always considered the time, the place, the person, and the totality of these circumstances, whenever, whatever and to whomsoever he was going to preach. That is why it has been said in the Nikāya :—

"Tathāgato arahaṃ sammāsambuddho atthaññū, dhammaññū, mattaññū, kālaññū, parisaññū, ... imehi Pañcahi dhammehi samannāgato Tathāgato .. . dhammen'eva anuttaraṁ dhamma-cakkaṃ pavatteti "[1]

"The noble Tathāgata, the perfectly Awakened one, knows the sense, the dhamma, the proportion, the time, the assembly. Endowed with these five qualities the Tathāgata turns the transcendental Wheel of the Law according to the Dhamma "[2]

From Brāhmanic, Buddhistic and Jaina sources, we learn that just at the time of the Buddha or a little before him, in India, Vedic Aryan domain (which comprised the countries of Kurus, Matsyas, Pañcālas and Śūrasenas) in the West, as well as Magadha and its surrounding countries in the East among the outlandic or mixed Aryans, differed from one another in social organisation[3] and environment, religious and philosophical conditions.

[1] A N V, p 131

[2] Translated by my friend Mr Sailendranath Mitra, M.A

[3] In the Brāhmanic West, naturally Brāhmanas were most powerful in society among the four castes and Kṣatriyas were subordinate to them, on the other hand

Of these factors, those specially relating to different religious and philosophical systems are very important for our consideration to enable us to understand the history of the period.

As is known, in every country the religious and philosophical movements create and fashion new social ideas and ideals. The most remarkable feature in Indian life at the time of the Buddha was the existence of various order of teachers both Vedic and un-Vedic with different opinions and views on life. This distinctly helped the progress of thought and development of social life. Both the land of the West as well as that of the East were centres of a series of eminent teachers with their separate systems of thought. Again the orders of teachers in both the West and the East, represent different groups or schools of thought. These groups may roughly be divided into either Sramanas and Brāhmans or Tāpasas and Paribrājakas.[1]

In the West, among the Vedic Aryans, there were two different schools of cultures. One is the school of 'Karma' and another the school of 'Jñāna.' The former was propounded and practised only by Brāhmana priests who occupied quite an influential position in the Vedic society at that time and their thought tended only to elaborate sacrificial rituals which, according to them, was the only essential feature of religious life, while the latter on the contrary speculated on religious and philosophical matters. The Kṣatriyas were uppermost in originating and developing this line of thought, though they were busy with military conquests during the early Vedic

in the non Brāhmanic East, the Kṣatriyas held the first position and Brāhmanas were under them Herein lies the essential distinction of the two social systems See 'English translation of Social Organisation in North East India in Buddha's Time' by Richard Fick, published by the Calcutta University, pp 11-13

[1] See Dr B M Barua's Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy, p 191

period but could make time for such serious thought during the closing period of the Rig-Veda. Problems like these were uppermost in their mind,—the creator of the world, the existence of a 'Universal entity' (mahātmā) and 'Individual entities' (jīvātmā) as well as the idea of essential unity of both. Therefore, their thought tended in contradistinction with that of Brāhmana priest, to encourage the subjective mode of attaining truth and living an ascetic life in the forests, practising penance and pursuing a life of inner culture and meditation. The Upanishadic speculations, as we call them, originated in this period. We should notice here that the Vedic Aryan culture as a whole would appear to be a lay movement; almost all their teachers were married householders. Now let us see what was the cultural condition in the East, the land of the outlandic Aryans or mixed Aryans. It seems that in religious and philosophical speculations and thought-movements the East surpassed the land of the West at this time It is more proper to say that at the time of the Buddha, the centre of speculative culture in India shifted from the land of the West to that of the East; that is to say, the centre of the culture shifted from Kuru-Pañcāla to Magadha. In the Magadha proper and territories around it, there were many teachers at the time of the Buddha, and they were not Ksatriya or Brāhmana householders as in the West but Śramanas and Paribrājakas. In Pāli literature they are called 'Tittiyas' or 'Tīrthankaras.' Dr. Rhys Davids, for the first time, called them 'Sophists,' and said that, they established numerous independent religious orders and several speculative institutions[1] Again he said in the same book, "Besides the hermits, there was another body of men, greatly respected throughout the country, quite peculiar to

[1] See 'Buddhist India' by Dr Rhys Davids pp. 141-160.

India, and not known even there much before the rise of Buddhism called the wanderers (Paribbāyakā). They were teachers, or sophists, who spent eight or nine months of every year wandering about precisely with the object of engaging in conversational discussions on matters of ethics and philosophy, nature lore and mysticism. Like the sophists among the Greeks, they differed very much in intelligence, in earnestness, and in honesty."

Those teachers whether Brāhmana or not by birth, were in general attitude Anti-Vedic and Anti-Brāhmanic.[1]

In the light of the evidence of Buddhist literature one can see that no less than 50 orders[2] and schools of recluses and wanderers were existing just at the time. Among them the most famous were the so-called six wandering teachers namely —

1. Pūrāṇa Kassapa who held 'Akriya-Vāda'[3] (*i.e.*, the soul does not act or cause others to act). And at the same time he held 'Ahetu-appaccaya-Vāda' (*i.e.*,[4] non-causation).

2. Kakuda Kātyāyana, who held also 'Akriya-Vāda' as well as 'Satta-Kāya-Vada' (*i.e.*, the doctrine of seven categories).[5]

3. Ajita Keśakambalin, who held 'Aññaṁjiv-aññṁsarira-Vāda' (*i.e.*, the doctrine of soul being distinct from the body).[6] And he was an annihilationist on the one hand and hedonist on the other and at the same time a materialist.[7]

[1] See Dr. B M Barua's Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy, p 189

[2] Regarding this point, Mr Bimala Charan Law, M A, has collected the names and schools of the wandering teachers in J. A S B, Vol XIV, 1918, No 7, pp 400-406

[3] Sūtra-Kritānaga I I I 13

[4] S. N. III, p 69

[5] D N I 57 and Sūtra-Kritānga I I I 15 16

[6] Dr B M Barua's Pre Buddhistic Indian Philosophy, p. 294

[7] Jacobi's Jaina Sūtras, Part 2, p. 341

4. Maskarin Gośāla, who held 'Pariṇāma-vāda' (*i.e.*, a doctrine of natural transformation).[1]

5 Sañjaya Belatthiputta who held 'Ajñāna-vāda' (*i.e.*, scepticism).[2]

6. Nigantha Nātaputta, who held 'Kriyā-Vāda' (*i.e.*, the law of action)

All these religious and philosophical movements either of the Vedic Aryans in the West or the Outlandic Aryans in the East, either of the school of Śramanas or Brāhmanas, can be included within eight kinds of categories stated in the Brahma-jāla-sutta in Digh-nikāya. —(1) Sassata-vāda, *i.e.*, the doctrine which says that both the external world and individual souls are eternal. (2) Ekacca-sassata-vāda, *i.e.*, the doctrine that a portion of the world and souls are eternal and the other part is not so (3) Antānantika, some hold that the world is finite and others that is infinite. (4) Amarā-vikkhepika, which does not give any definite answer in any question on any subject (5) Adhicca-samuppannika, which says that origin of things is without a cause. (6) Uddhamāghatanika, which believes in the future existence of human souls. (7) Uccheda-vāda, the doctrine which says that there is a soul but that it will cease to exist. (8) Diṭṭha-dhamma-nibbāna-vāda which says that there is a soul and that it can attain perfect bliss in the present world

All the above ideas stood on quite a contrary relation to the Buddha's thought. Most of them were one-sided extremes and quite naturally led ignorant people more and more to the 'Eternalists,' 'Annihilationists,'

[1] According to Jaina Bhagavati sūtra and its commentary his doctrine is mentioned as 'Pattaparihāra Vāda, (see Dr B M Barua's Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy, p 304) In D N I, p 53, his doctrine is mentioned as Niyati-sangati-bhāva parinata-Vāda

[2] In D N I, pp 24 28, his doctrine mentioned as Amarā vikkhepika (or Eel-wriggler.)

[3] These eight categories sum up 62 kinds of different opinions which existed in India about the time of Buddha

'Determinists,' 'Fortuitist,' 'Individualist,' 'Fatalist,' 'Hedonist,' 'Ascetic,' etc, of course, those Śramana and Brāhmana teachers must be ranked in the class of philosophers just because they in their own way had sufficient penetration of thought to recognise the suffering and miserable state of the 'Samsāra' and also they found out ways for men's salvation. That was also just what Gotama Buddha did. It must be recognised, however, that such extreme ideas or one-sided ways could not lead men to real truth

Buddha with his characteristic insight, understood the particular religious and philosophical condition of the country at that time, therefore, against their ideas he kept his 'Ontological perception' aside from the common mass and preached directly his 'Phenomenological perception.' Besides this he established the 'Middle-path' as the real way to salvation and avoided all kinds of extremes.

It was all useless discussion, he said, to inquire into the origin of all things and existences as the Śramanas and Brāhmanas did. He considered that such enquiries were absolutely without any profit and would never lead men to salvation. So when Malumka asked Buddha whether the existence of the world is eternal or ephemeral, he made no answer, but simply said :—

"It is necessary to come out at once from fire for those who are in the burning flames and it is necessary to take away the arrow from the body of those who have been struck with the poisonous arrow. They are quite ignorant, who think about the condition when they will be coming out of the fire, while they actually are burning in fire; they are also ignorant who, being struck by the poisonous arrow want to know the construction of the arrow without attempting to remove it from the body."[1]

[1] M N, Vol I, p 29

Thus in accordance with the particular time, social condition and people's inclination and necessity, Buddha permitted himself to preach 'Phenomenological doctrines' in his lifetime Now we can understand why 'Phenomenological doctrines' had been preached in Buddha's lifetime and at the same time why from the historical point of view, it has been called 'Original Buddhism.'

Here such a question must arise naturally, when and to whom the Buddha preached his 'Introspectional doctrines?' In answer to this, we have at least two explanations to offer. First, Buddha preached his 'Introspectional doctrines' even in his lifetime; secondly, this aspect of his doctrines remained to be manifested or developed by brilliant disciples of Buddha and their followers after the Master's Parinirvāna.

Let us now discuss these points one after another. (I) With regard to the first point; Buddha actually preached 'Phenomenological doctrines' in his lifetime according to men's capacity. But from Mahāyānic statements, we come to know that Buddha's final aim was to preach his 'Ontological doctrines,' so that all men could attain salvation equally as he himself did. From the same source we also come to know that as soon as Buddha understood that the common people had not sufficient mental and intellectual strength to grasp 'his Introspectional doctrines,' he hesitated at once to disseminate such high doctrines among them. So it is said in the Upāyakauśalyaparivarta of Saddharma pundarīka-sūtra :—

"गम्भीरं शारिपुत्र दुर्दृशं दुरनुबोधं बुद्धज्ञानं तथागतैरर्हद्भिः सम्यक-संबुद्धैः प्रतिविद्धं दुर्विज्ञेयं सर्वश्रावकप्रत्येकबुद्धैः। ....तथागत एव शारिपुत्र तथागतस्य धर्मं देशयेय्यान्धर्मांस्तथागतो जानाति।[1]

[1] Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra, Part I, pp. 29 30.

"The Buddha-knowledge, Śāriputra, is profound, difficult to understand, difficult to comprehend. It is difficult for all disciples and Protyekabuddhas to fathom the knowledge arrived at by Tathāgatas. .... None but a Tathāgata, Śāriputra, can impart to a Tathāgata alone those laws which the Tathāgata knows."[1]

A similar expression is also to be found even in the Pāli canon .—

"Tassa mayham bhikkhave etad ahosi, adhigato kho me ayaṁ dhammo gambhīro duddaso duranubodho santo panito atakkāvacaro nipuṇo paṇḍita-vedanīyo."[2]

"Then this thought occurs to me, verily has this Dhamma been realised by me, the Dhamma which is profound, which is difficult to perceive and difficult to understand, which is tranquil, and excellent, which has not its foundation upon argumentation, but which is subtle, and comprehensible only by the wise."

But nevertheless it was a fact that Buddha preached his 'Introspectional doctrines' in an esoteric, mystical garb for the advanced disciples The following quotation will clearly support this point; in the Saddharmapuṇdarīka-sūtra, it is stated :—

अथ खल्वायुष्माञ्छारिपुत्रस्तासां चतसृणां पर्षदां विचिकित्साकथंकथां विदित्वा चेतसैव चेतःपरिवितर्कमाज्ञायात्मना च धर्मसंशयप्राप्तस्तस्यां वेलायां भगवन्तमेतदवोचत्। को भगवन्हेतुः कः प्रत्ययो यद्भगवान धिमात्रं पुनः पुनस्तथागतानामुपायकौशल्यज्ञानदर्शनधर्मदेशनां संवर्णयति। गम्भीरश्च मे धर्मोऽभिसंबुद्ध इति। दुर्विज्ञेयं च संधाभाष्यमिति पुनः पुनः संवर्णयति। न च मे भगवतोऽन्तिकादेवंरूपो धर्मपर्यायः श्रुतपूर्वः।"[3]

"And the venerable Sāriputra, who apprehended the doubt and uncertainty of the four classes of the audience

[1] S. B E, Vol XXI, pp. 30 32

[2] Mahāvagga 1 5 2-3 (Vol I, p 46) S N VI 1 I. (Vol. I, pp. 136-7) M. N. (Vol I, pp. 167-168)

[3] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Part I, pp 33-4

and guessed their thoughts from what was passing in his own mind, himself being in doubt about the law, then said to the Lord ; what, O Lord, is the cause, what the reason of the Lord so repeatedly and extremely extolling the skilfulness, knowledge, and preaching of the Tathāgata? Why does he repeatedly extol it by saying, 'Profound is the law by me discovered; it is difficult to understand the mystery of the Tathāgatas.' Never before have I heard from the Lord such a discourse on the law."[1]

In the same sūtra :—

"बहूनि संधावचनेहि चोक्तं दुर्बोध्यमेतं हि अग्निच्चितेहि ॥"[2]

"They have spoken in many mysteries; hence it is difficult to understand (them)."[3]

Therefore, Nāgārjuna said in his Prajñāpāramitā-Śāstra :—[4]

"There are two kinds of Buddhism. one is 'esoteric' (guhya) and another is 'exoteric' (vyakta) In the esoteric doctrine which he preached for only Bodhisattvas, it has been said that Bodhisattvas only obtain the reality which is beyond the birth and death In the exoteric doctrine it has been preached by him that all Arhats are puṇya-kṣetras."[5]

Now let us see what light on this point can be had from Mahāyāna sūtras. If we read Amitārtha-sūtra and Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, which are regarded as the most important of Mahāyāna sūtras, we come to know, that Buddha preached his introspectional doctrine in the last part of his life. The Amithārtha-sūtra runs thus:—

"After meditating six years under the Bodhi-tree, I have arrived at Supreme, Perfect Enlightenment and

[1] S B E, Vol XXI, p 35

[2] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Part I, p 59

[3] S B E, Vol XXI, p 59.

[4] Wang Bundle, Vol I, p 29a and Vol 4, p 25b of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

[5] Every individual is a Kṣetra or a field (metaphorically) in which puṇya (virtues or merits) may be produced.

I have penetrated into the secret of the Dharma with the supreme eye of knowledge (buddha-netra), and have come to know that this Dharma cannot be preached at present. Because, I know, that people possess different capacities and different desires. Therefore, since that time, I have been preaching several other doctrines according to their requirements as means or expedient (upāya). Thus during the last forty years, I have not revealed the true doctrine. So people obtained different conceptions of truth but could not get Supreme Enlightenment at once.

Now I shall preach this Mahāyāna Amithārtha-sūtra (*i.e.*, sūtra on the immeasurable meaning). This is the inconceivable deep doctrine of Buddha. Therefore, this cannot be understood by Śrāvakas, Pratyeka-Buddhas and even the Bodhisattvas of the 'Dasavihārā' or the second stage of Bodhisattva-mārga. But a Tathāgata alone can convey and explain this doctrine to a Tathāgatha, and a Tathāgatha alone can be understood "[1]

Again in the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra we meet with the following statement :—

"शारिपुत्र तथागतो ऽप्यर्हन्सम्यकसंबुद्धो न मृषवादो भवति येन पूर्वमुपायकौशल्येन त्रीणि यानान्युपदर्शयित्वा पश्चान्महायानेनैव सत्त्वान्परिनिर्वापयति "[2]

"Śāriputra, the Tathāgata, the Arhat, &c, tells no falsehood when by an able device he first holds forth three Vehicles and afterwards leads all to complete Nirvāṇa by the one great Vehicle."[3]

Again in the same sūtra we have :—

"उपायकौशल्य प्रकाशयन्ति त्रिविधानि यानान्युपदर्शयन्ति ।
एकं च यानं परिदीपयन्ति बुद्धा इमामुत्तमशान्तभूमिम् ॥"[4]

[1] In Bundle, Vol I, pp *3a-4b* of Chinese Tripitaka (see, also Nanjio's catalogue, p 43, No 133

[2] Vol I, p 82

[3] S B E, Vol XXI, p 82

[4] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka sūtra, Part I, p 53

"Those Buddhas while manifesting skilfulness display various vehicles though, at the same time, indicating the one single vehicle.[1] the supreme place of blessed rest."[2]

From the above quotations, we get two different statements; one is the 'Periodical division' of Buddha's preaching; another is the 'Characteristic division' of Buddha's doctrines and teachings. First, regarding the 'Periodical division' we come to learn from above statements that Buddha preached his Phenomenological doctrines in the early Part of his life, and Introspectional doctrines or Ontological teachings in the last part of his life Of course, this statement does not tally with known historical facts. Because, from the historical point of view, there can be no such particular periodical division in the Buddha's preaching except the two-fold forms—'esoteric' and 'exoteric' But from the above evidence we can easily conclude, that Buddha preached his Introspectional doctrines even in his lifetime. Here, then, a question may arise, if there were no such precise periodical division in the Buddha's preaching, then why such a statement has been made at all in the said Mahāyāna sūtras, that Buddha preached Phenomenological doctrine in early part of his life, while he gave away the Mahāyāna or Ontological doctrines in the last part of his life.

In my opinion, Mahāyana sūtras and the statements embodied therein undoubtedly came into being after Buddha's death, and these were the products of a set of advanced and brilliant disciples of the Buddha These Mahāyānic ideas were the results of a deep, critical penetration over the Buddha's Introspectional perceptions

[1] In the above quotation words 'Three Vehicles' and 'Various Vehicles' are indications of expedient doctrines which have been indicated in the Amitārtha sūtra The words 'Great Vehicle' and 'One Vehicle' are the indications of Buddha's self-introspectional perception

[2] S B E, Vol XVI, p 53

and his teachings. Thereby they thought, the Buddha's real intention was being fructified. Those Mahāyānic views were really their expositions over the Buddha's Introspectional ideas as rightly grasped by them.

Historically, it must be said that Buddha preached his Phenomenological doctrines in an 'Exoteric form' to the people and his Ontological doctrines in the 'Esoteric form' was reserved only for advanced or brilliant men.

Teachings on both these lines proceeded simultaneously without implying any periodical or chronological division. However, from the doctrinal point of view, the former is the mere expedient (upāya) doctrine, while the latter is the real doctrine. This order equates well with the inherent natural law in the spiritual domain. Here the former or 'exoteric' must come first and the latter or 'esoteric' would come next. All classes of human beings, either wise or ignorant, have to pass through, first, the expedient stage of doctrines for some time as the first step for higher culture, and when they are well-grounded and sufficiently advanced they have to come at last to the real doctrine or final stage. This may have led to the conception of the said 'Periodical division' that we meet with in the Mahāyānic sūtras.

Here we can at once understand that the above statements in Mahāyāna sūtras are not at all different from historical facts on the question of the existence of Buddha's Introspectional doctrines and teachings in his lifetime. Now, at the same time we also understand why Mahāyānists have called Buddha's Phenomenological doctrines by the term 'Exoteric' (or vyaktopadeśa) and his Ontological doctrines under the name 'Esoteric' (or guhyopadeśa).

Next, let us see what is the significance of the above noted 'Characteristic division' of the Buddha's doctrines which we meet with in the above sūtras? This is rather

an important consideration in order to understand aright Mahāyāna doctrines. According to these statements, the doctrine which Buddha preached in the early part of his life has been said 'Expedient doctrine' or (upāyakauśalya-upadeśa). Sometimes the same has been called 'Two-fold vehicle' or (dviyāna) as well as 'Three-fold vehicle' or (triyāna); while the doctrine which he preached in the latter part of his life has been termed, 'True doctrine' or (satya-upadeśa) or sometimes 'Great vehicle' or (mahāyāna), as well as 'One vehicle' or (ekayāna).

A further elaborate explanation as well as re-iteration of this point is to be met with in the Prajñāpāramitā and other sūtras In the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra itself Subhāti asks Buddha thus, "What do you say? Is the Bodhisattva stage complete or incomplete?"

Buddha answers, "Bodhisattva stage is itself complete but not incomplete. Another question still. "Which vehicle (yāna) do you think, sir, to be complete?"

He answered, "The Two-fold vehicle (dviyīna) is incomplete, while the Buddha vehicle (buddhayāna) alone is perfectly complete."[1]

The above quotation plainly suggests that the doctrine of the Two-fold vehicle (dviyāna) is neither complete nor real. While the Buddha vehicle (buddhayāna) is alone complete. This statement equates well with the general trend of the Amitārtha-sūtra as well as the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra.

Nāgārjuna also speaks in the same clear strain in his Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra :—

"In the Śrāvaka sūtras (hīnayāna) the doctrine of Dharma-tathatā also has been preached, but not clearly enough, while in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras it has been

[1] Pañcaviṁśati-Prajñāpāramitā sūtra, fasciculi 83 i e, Yuch Bundle. Vol. 2, p 52a, Chinese Tripiṭaka

clearly explained. Therefore, in them we easily get a real penetration into the doctrine."[1]

In the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra-upodeśa[2] of Vasubandhu we meet with a similar idea. In the said upadeśa, Vasubandhu has given seventeen different names of Mahāyāna[3] of which the fourteenth one is "Sūtra in which the doctrine of One Vehicle has been preached" or (ekayāna-upadeśa-sūtra).

As a further explanation of the fourteenth name we have the following from Vasubandhu :—

"The name is so, because the doctrine embodied in it fully explains and indicates the reality of Supreme Perfect Enlightenment. But the doctrine of Two-fold vehicle or (dviyāna) is not the perfect reality."[4]

The above quotations clearly indicate the two different characteristic doctrines to be met with in the Buddha's preachings. Next, we understand that the

[1] Prajñāpāramitā Śāstra, 68 Fasciculi, i.e., Wang Bundle, Vol 4, p 4a, Chinese Tripitaka

[2] Wang Bundle, Vol. 6, pp 59b-a, Chinese Tripitaka

[3] Seventeen different names of Mahāyāna are —

(1) "Sūtra on the immeasurable meanings" or (Amitirtha-sūtra)
(2) "Most excellent sūtra" or (Uttama-sūtra)
(3) Mahāvaipulya sūtra
(4) 'Doctrine which was preached for Bodhisattva."
(5) "The doctrine which is being protected by Buddhas"
(6) "Esoteric doctrine of Buddha"
(7) The Pitaka of all Buddhas" or (Sarva Buddhāṇām Pitaka)
(8) "The Esoteric place of all Buddhas" or (Sarva Buddhāṇāṁ guhya-sthānaṁ).
(9) "The sūtra which relates the birth of All Buddhas."
(10) "Sacred place of All Buddhas"
(11) "The wheel of the Law which is being turned by All Buddhas"
(12) Sarva Buddhāṇām dhīradhātū
(13) Sarva Buddhāṇām upāyakauśalya sūtra
(14) Ekayāna upadeśa sūtra
(15) Paramārtha sthānam
(16) Saddharmapuṇḍarīka
(17) Uttama dharma

The Sanskrit restoration of above names is purely personal.

[4] Wang Bundle Vol 6, p 59a of Chinese Tripitaka.

Phenomenological doctrines were being preached according to men's requirements and capabilities, but that was not the real doctrine; while the Introspectional and Ontological doctrines explained in the light of the Buddha's independent self-perception was only real and final.

Thus, from the above we understand clearly, that the Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological doctrines existed even in his lifetime and that was the only real doctrine from his own point of view.

II. Let us, then, consider historically our next point and see how the Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological doctrines had been developed after his parinirvāna by a set of brilliant disciples and followers. To discuss this point, it will be necessary to know at first in what Sūtras, the Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological doctrines have been recorded. For this purpose again, it is better to speak here of the classifications and systematic division of Buddhism made by great Chinese Buddhist scholars, during the period from the fifth to ninth centuries A.D., so that we may understand what sort of Sūtras were put under the Mahāyānic division. According to Chinese Buddhist history, during the period from the time of the Sui-dynasty to that of the Thān-dynasty, i.e., from 581-906 A.D.,[1] Nine Buddhist Schools were established in China. Among them, "the Three śāstra schools," "The Thin-thāi school," "The Avatamsaka school," and "The Dharma-lakṣaṇa school" came under the Mahāyāna head.[2] And

[1] In this period Buddhism was in a most flourishing condition in China, so it has been rightly called, "The blossoming age of Buddhism"

[2] Nine schools were the following (of which four have already been referred to)

(1) "The Pure land sect"
(2) "The Dhyāna sect"
(3) "The Montra sect"
(4) "The Abhidharma sect"
(5) "The Vinaya sect"

Of the above, again, the first three were Mahāyānic and the last two Hinayānic.

Ciā-Siān-tā-sh', C'-có-tā-sh, Hhien-shen-tā-sh' and Hiuen-thsang were the respective founders or systematizers of these schools. Be it remembered, however, that they all made classifications of Buddhism according to their own standpoint. However, on the whole, all their classifications agree equally on main points. All of them made both a periodical, as well as a doctrinal, classification of Buddhism.

First, three different periods of the Buddha's preaching are recognised by all :—In the 'First period,' that is to say, just after three weeks of his Enlightenment, the Buddha preached the doctrine embodied in the Avatamska-sūtras which he put forth in order to test the people, thereby to understand whether Ontological doctrines will be appropriate for them or not. These sūtras, later on, were eventually regarded as the most important records of the Buddha's Introspectional perception, and necessarily of great value as Mahāyāna sūtras. But Buddha soon found that the people were too ignorant to understand such profound doctrines Therefore, he changed at once his intention and had recourse to a new method and began to preach 'Four Agamas' (*i.e*, Four Nikāyas in Pāli) quite in keeping with men's capacity The doctrines herein embodied were 'Expedient doctrine' (upāya-upadeśa). This is the 'Second period':—In course of time, Buddha came to learn that those people were then more advanced in their mental culture so that it was high time for him to preach his Introspectional and Ontological doctrines. Thus, then, this 'Third period' was reserved and kept aside to preach, when the right time would arrive, his true perception as contained in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras, Mahāvaipulya-sūtras, Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra, as well as Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāna-sūtras.

Of the above three periodical divisions, the first was simply a trial stage. So that, really speaking, his actual

preaching was covered by the last two periods. This periodical classification of the said Chinese scholars is quite on a par with the statement in Amitārtha-sūtra alluded to above, as well as Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra. It is beyond doubt that the classifications of the Chinese scholars were based upon the statements on the Amitārtha and Saddharmapuṇdarīka-sūtras of Mahāyāna.

Next, let us briefly state the Chinese classification of doctrine of Buddhism They made a two-fold division on the whole. The doctrines embodied in the so-called 'Four Āgamas' have been variously called 'Triyāna doctrines,' 'Expedient doctrine' 'The Doctrine which was set forth according to peoples on capacity.' Later the generic name 'Hīnayāna' was applied to it. While the doctrines preached in the Third period with that of the Avatamsaka sūtras (which Buddha put forth as a test in the First period) were called the 'True doctrine' which later on came to be known as 'Mahāyāna'

Of the above mentioned two-fold classification, the 'periodical one' is very important for our present purpose. Because, from these statements we come to know clearly that the Mahāyāna sūtras; Avatamsaka, Prajñapāramitā Saddharmapuṇdarīka and Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtras were the records of Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological doctrines. This was our main point of inquiry and here we arrived at the right point.

If Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological doctrines came to be recorded in the Mahāyāna sūtra-form, then, to be quite logical, it should not be said that this doctrine did exist in the Buddha's life-time, because, from the historical point of view, these Mahāyāna sūtras came to exist undoubtedly after Buddha's Parinirvāna and so-called 'Four Nikāyas' or 'Āgamas' are only regarded as authentic records in comparison with later Mahāyānic

sūtras. Not only that, it is for the first time that we meet with the names of those Mahāyāna-sūtras in Nāgārjuna's Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra;[1] the commentary on Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra. Therefore, it can be said without hesitation, that those Mahāyāna-sūtras came to being at the time of, or some time before Nāgārjuna. We have another inter-related statement on this matter, in Paramārtha's commentary on the Nikāya-avalambana-śāstra (Pu-Chih-I-lun) of Vasumitra,[2] and as its epitome we have the following.—

"During two hundred years after Buddha's Mahāparinirvāna, three schools sprang up from the Mahāsanghika, namely, (*i*) Ekavyavahārika, (*ii*) Lokottara-vāda, (*iii*) Kaukkutika. And the cause of this separation was at first, Mahādeva, the leader of the Mahāsanghikas who dwelt in Angottara country in the North of Rājagriha. There he preached the doctrine of Avatamsaka, Prjñāpāramitā-sūtras, etc. At that time, two parties seceded from the main Mahāsanghika school on account of Mahādeva's preaching. Because some of them believed in that doctrine, they together formed one party; while others did not agree and they made up another party." If we take this, as an authentic statement, then we can say at once that some of the Mahāyāna sūtras were existing in the time of the Second Council, held a hundred years after the Buddha's Parinirvāṇa at Vaiśālī. But undoubtedly, from the historical point of view or from the point of time, Mahāyāna sūtras came into being definitely not before, but after, Buddha's death. At the same time it cannot also be said that Buddha's Ontological perceptions or

[1] See Appendix.

[2] This original commentary has been lost, and I culled this statement from a quotation in 'San ron-gen-gi,' Vol I, p 51 (in Chinese)

those Mahāyānic doctrines (in their sūtra-form) were existing in Buddha's lifetime.

Here, we find the definite reason why we have termed Mahāyāna Buddhism as 'Developed form of Buddhism.'

Thus in the course of the above long discussion we have tried to show clearly the validity of two different positions regarding the Buddha's Ontological perceptions or Mahāyāna Buddhism. First, the Ontological doctrines had been existing in the Buddha's lifetime. Second, the said doctrines waited to be developed or manifested only after the Buddha's death. My attempt has been to show that both the statements are correct as they stand by themselves as historical facts. Because from the historical point of view 'Ontological doctrines' (or Mahāyāna Buddhism) are Developed form of Buddhism and 'Phenomenological doctrines' (or Hīnayāna Buddhism) only are Original Buddhism. But from the standpoint of idea or perception we cannot deny the existence of Mahāyānic doctrines or 'Ontological perception' in the Buddha's lifetime. Not only that, we may go a step further, and say that in his lifetime, the Buddha preached such doctrines among his advanced disciples in the esoteric way. This is the reason, I think, why we meet even in the Pāli Nikāya many passages which clearly indicate Buddha's Introspectional perception.

Let us now at the end of this section give a résumé of the whole discussion. We have learnt that the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' in their relation with one another have following senses :—

(1) The terms as expressing the relation between 'Phenomenological perception' and 'Ontological perception.' *This is from the point of Buddha's perception.*

(2) The terms as expressing the relation between 'Expedient doctrines' and 'True doctrines' *This is from the doctrinal point.*

(3) The terms as expressing the relation between 'Exoteric doctrines' and 'Esoteric doctrines.' *This is from the point of Buddha's way of preaching.*

(4) The terms as expressing the relation between 'Original Buddhism' and 'Developed form of Buddhism.' *This is from historical point of view.*

Now, we have to discuss "By which early Buddhist school the Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological doctrines have been developed and transformed into the Mahāyāna Buddhism as generally called. This question we shall take up in the next section.

CHAPTER II.

I.—Through men of what school and at what time the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna came to be used.

In the last chapter, I have discussed various interpretations on the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' and their relation from many points of view. Our duty, now, is to see, how these terms came into use? That is to say, by whom, or through which school and from what time, the terms were made current? In order to clear the question, we have to discuss two problems at least. Firstly, we should deal with the 'Men' or 'School' through whom or which, the said terms were used. Besides these, many other allied questions also will crop up as side issues, but I hope they will be all made clear in the course of our discussion on the two main questions. Incidentally a very important question, *viz*, "*the origin of Mahayāna Buddhism*" also will be explained.

Now, let us take up the first question And in doing so, we would draw your attention, at first, to the point already noted that the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' on the very face bear a relative sense, 'Superiority' and 'Inferiority,' as well as 'Praise and Depreciation.' Obviously, as we can all easily imagine, such terms, speaking from an emotional point of view, cannot come from the quarter of the men of Hīnayāna. This is exactly the reason why the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' and other allied ones having the same sense are occurring in Mahāyāna Sūtras and Śāstras innumerable times, but there is even not a single instance of them in the Pāli Nikāya.[1]

[1] In certain statements contained in introduction of Ekottarāgama-sūtra, in Chinese we meet with the term 'Mahāyāna' However, so far as we understand these portions are later additions

Our next question then is, who was the founder of the Mahāyāna school and whom can we call the first Mahāyānist, if at all? As I have told you in the introductory note, some scholars of Buddhism are of opinion that the founders of Mahāyānism were Aśvaghosa I, Nāgārjuna, as well as Asanga and Vasubandhu. And among them Nāgārjuna was regarded as the chief one. Their opinion mainly rests on two points. (*i*) According to the Mahāyāna tradition, Mahāyāna Sūtras like Prajñāpāramitā, Avataṁsaka and Saddharmapuṇḍarīka were kept in the palace of a Nāga king before the time of Nāgārjuna.[1] But Nāgārjuna brought them from there, made their contents public, spread those doctrines and established Mahāyāna Buddhism, as well as its school. Since that time Mahāyānic doctrines came to be known. On this tradition scholars base their view that Nāgārjuna was the founder of Mahāyāna Buddhism. (*ii*) Next, Buddhism as known to Brāhmanical śāstras like Mādhavāchārya's Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha, Śāmkarabhāsya on Brahmasūtras as well as to Jaina books like Guṇaratna's commentary on Shaddarśana samucchaya, is divided into four schools, namely: Sautrantika, Vaibhāsika, Mādhyamika and Yogācāra. Among these the first two belong to Hīnayāna, while the last two came under Mahāyāna. According to them the founder of the Mādhyamika school was Nāgārjuna, and of the Yogācāra school were Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. Hence they are apt to hold the view that men like Nāgārjuna, Asanga and Vasubandhu were founders of Mahāyāna Buddhism. But from my point of view, the said opinion is entirely wrong. Of course, Nāgārjuna may claim credit as a great systematizer or expounder of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

[1] Wassileff's Buddhism, p 188 ff. There are many like traditions in Chinese Buddhist texts See Appendix

But distinctly he was not the founder of Mahāyāna Buddhism. There is no question of Asanga and Vasubandhu at all. This fact will be clear to us if we critically look at the mighty work: Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra and Daśabhūmi-vibhāsā-śastra of Nāgārjuna. The former is a commentary on Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra and the latter is a commentary on the Avatmasaka-sūtra. In these Śāstras the author quotes many Mahāyāna sūtras, for example, Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra, Amitāyusha-sūtra and Vimalakirtī-sūtra, etc.[1] This fact convinces us sufficiently that there were undoubtedly many Mahāyāna sūtras before Nāgārjuna. Then, how can we say that Nāgārjuna was the founder of Mahāyāna Buddhism? And this fact itself indicates that there were certain schools which acted as forerunners to Mahāyāna Buddhism before Nāgārjuna (about 250 A. D.—350 A. D), and these previous schools were gradually manifesting and expounding the Buddha's Ontological perception which in their Sūtra-form were termed Mahāyāna Buddhism. Otherwise, how can we explain the existence of those Pre-Nāgārjuna Sūtras, if Mahāyāna doctrines were not spreading beforehand. Moreover, from Paramārtha's commentary on Nikāyā-avalaṁbana-śāstra (Pu-Chih-I-lum) of Vasumitra, as I have stated before, we come to know that Prajñāpāramitā and Avataṁsaka-sūtras were existing within two hundred years after Buddha's Parinirvāṇa, and these had been used by the Mahāsanghikas. Of course, those Sūtras would not be in the same form then as at present, these were certainly an original nucleus.

If this was the case, then, it is not wrong to observe that men of the Mahāsanghika schools were closely connected with Mahāyāna Buddhism. Nay, from this point of view, it was they who manifested Buddha's

[1] See Appendix

Introspectional and Ontological doctrines which were embodied first in the Mahāyāna sūtras and ultimately came to be known as Mahāyāna Buddhism. Of course, really speaking, there was no actual founder of Mahāyāna Buddhism except the Buddha himself Because, its ideas were existing in Buddha's perception, and only remained to be manifested into set doctrines or in the Sūtra-form by the Mahāsanghika men. However, from the historical point of view, if any one insistently asks me "*Who is the founder of Mahāyāna Buddhism?*" then, I would like to say, that the men of Mahāsanghika schools were the founders. Let us discuss now this point a little elaborately. As I have told you many times before, the Mahāyāna doctrines were the exposition of Buddha's self-introspectional and ontological perceptions.

Without a human agency, such introspectional ideas could not be transformed into set doctrines, and these again into Sūtra-forms later on. But such deep and high ideas or doctrines could be understood or penetrated not by common people but by the advanced men, through their inner intuition. Speaking from the point of view of mental culture, the Sthavnavādins belonged to the ultra-conservative party, as we know from Dipavaṁśa and Mahāvaṁśa as well as other historical records of Indian Buddhists. Therefore, they simply preserved Buddha's Phenomenological doctrine (known as Original Buddhism) very strictly, carefully too, without going into deep ontological ideas. But brilliant thinkers among the Buddha's disciples were naturally progressive. Therefore, such men could not rest satisfied without going further into the bottom and penetrating Buddha's Introspectional perception on his Ontological doctrines. The Mahāsanghikas as generally called, as historical fact tell us, were the heralds of progress and they felt not the

least hesitation to plunge deep into the matter and sift out the truth whatever it might be. The chief leaders of this party, it seems to me, were the Vajjians of Vaiśālī. They were exactly in every respect men of the said mettle among all the Outlandic Aryans. Therefore, predominantly Vajjian Mahāsanghikas having such deep wisdom penetrated into the Buddha's Introspectional perception and thoroughly understood his Ontological doctrines, and they tried to manifest them into Sūtra-form. This is the reason why they had Prajñāpāramitā and Avatamsaka-sūtras, during the two hundred years after Buddha's Parinirvāṇa, as Paramārtha informs us. So, it will not be wrong to say that *Mahāsanghikas were the forefathers of Mahāyāna Buddhists and their schools.*

But, unfortunately for us, we have no external evidence for this. Therefore, we would state here our internal consideration to prove this matter. In order to do this, we have to compare the doctrine of Mahā-sanghikas with that of Mahāyāna sūtras on the one hand and on the other with that of Buddha's Introspectional perception, so that it will be clear to us that those three sets of doctrines are not only mutually interconnected with each other but in a sense all identical. Ultimately we will see that Buddha's Introspectional doctrines were transformed into Mahāyāna sūtra setting through the men of the Mahasanghika schools. We reserve the next section for a full discussion of this. Here I draw your attention to one point. The doctrine of every school of Buddhism, really speaking, is mainly concerned with three points at least. One—the doctrines which deal with Cosmic Existence, Second—that which deals with Buddhalogy, and Lastly, those that deal with conception on Human Life Therefore, our discussion on the inter-relation between the Buddha's Ontological perception,

the doctrine of Mahāsanghika and those of Mahāyāna sūtras will proceed on the above three lines.

II.—(a) The relation between the doctrines of Mahāsanghikas and those of Mahāyāna sūtras on Cosmic existence

Buddha's Phenomenological teachings as well as Theravāda's doctrines are, generally speaking, Original Buddhism So both the conceptions on the Cosmic existence have actually no difference. They equally hold that 'All is impermanent,' and 'All is without Ego.' That is to say, according to them, all phenomenon is nothing but the aggregate productions of elements and these aggregates have been always formed by Cause (hetu) and Conditions (pratyaya) All such composite things are always subject to an invariable law of change and law of cause and effect. Therefore, there is no existence of an eternal Universal Entity or a person who may be regarded as the Creator and Controller of this world.

There was a branch school of Theravāda which has been known under the name of Sarvāstivāda. The latter separated from the main Theravādins about three-hundred years after Buddha's Parinirvāna, and established its centres in Kashmira and Gandhāra This school differed a little from the main Theravādins in doctrine,[1] and their doctrine is generally known to us as 'Anātmā-sarvāstivāda.'[2] According to them, all cosmic existences are aggregate productions. Therefore, they are always subject to an invariable law of change as well

[1] Here we should remember that main point of difference between the Theravādins of Northern school and the Sarvāstivādins, is that the former maintained the superiority of Sūtra among the three piṭakas while the latter maintained the superiority of Abhidharma

[2] This name has been restored by me from Japanese book

as subject to a law of cause and effect. So there is no existence of an eternal Universal Entity or individual Entities. Thus far their opinion tallies with that of the main Theravādins But this school held a characteristic opinion quite peculiar to itself. According to these Sarvāstivādins, though composite things are impermanent, however, the elements or substances composing them are themselves permanent. In view of this, this school has been called 'Sarvāstivāda.' But the so-called Mahāsanghikas, on the contrary, held quite different opinions from both the main Theravāda as well as its offshoot—Sarvāstivāda. This school is known to us under the name 'Anātmā-adharmavāda.'[1] According to their view on the cosmic existence, an Universal Entity or individual Entities as well as cosmic existences—as taken composite thing or in their elements—are all non-existents. Hence this school has been called 'Anātmā-adharmavāda.' Of course, originally the Mahāsanghika school did not go so far as these subtle ideas. But in their branch schools such ideas had been brought out fully. Vasumitra's Nikāya-bheda-dharmamati-chakra Śāstra (I-pu-tun-lun-lun) informs us that "There is no existence of cosmic elements in the past and future, but they exist in the present only."[2] However, according to Paramārtha's commentary on Nikāya-avalambana Śāstra (pu-chih-i-lun), Ekavyavahārika; the first branch school of the original Mahāsaṅghika party held that "All existences of this loka (world) and uttaraloka (higher world) are simply provisional names. Therefore there is no real existence."[3]

[1] This name has been restored by me from Japanese book
[2] I-pu-tsun-lun-lun, p 92, Toyo-Daigaku edition of Tokyo
[3] *I have quoted this from San-ron-gen gi Vol I p 51.*

Dr. Eun Mayeda, a great Japanese Buddhist scholar, has clearly pointed out the doctrine of this school :—

"This school holds such conception that all things in the Universe exist in the three period of time—past, present and future—are simply provisional. And there are no noumenon existences Therefore, this school is more advanced in doctrine than that of the original Mahāsanghika school."[1] Thus in this Ekavyavahārika school, the idea of 'Anātmā-adharmavāda of Mahāsanghikas as a whole, has found a full expression. Again, this idea has a similar bearing like the 'Śūnyatā' doctrine. Paramārtha in his commentary on Nikāya-avalambana-śāstra characterizes doctrines of Lokottaravāda, the third branch school of the Mahāsanghikas as 'Śūnyātmā-śūnyadharma-vāda.'[2] Consequently, we are justified to say that the Mahāsanghika school as a whole, upholds a similar doctrine like that of 'Sarva-śūnyatā of Mahāyāna-sūtras.

Next, let us turn our eyes to the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras, one of the most important set of Mahāyāna sūtras regarding as a record of the Buddha's Ontological perception, specially conception on Cosmic existence. There we will find exactly the same idea as among the Mahāsanghikas on the same subject, but rather in a much more definite and concrete form.

The essential idea of Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras can be summed up in the words "Nirākāra-sarva-śūnyatā"[3] (all is formless, Śūnyatā) or "Sarvadharmānāṁ śūnyatā na sā śakyābhilāpitūm"[4] (All existence is Śūnyatā and it cannot be explained) This is exactly the idea of the Mahāsanghikas. In a sense it can be said that the

[1] In his Historical Discourse of Mahāyāna Buddhism, p 72 (In Japanese)

[2] This is found in San ron gen-gi, Vol I, p 52

[3] Such passages are found everywhere in the Prajñāpāramitā-sutras

[4] Aṣṭasāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā, p 3 4 8, Bibliotheca Indica series

Mahāsanghika doctrine of 'Anātmā-adharma' has been elaborately expressed in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras under the term 'Śūnyatā' or 'Śūnyapuruṣa-śūnyadharma.'[1] Here we have an important matter to draw your attention to. Many Buddhist scholars are apt to explain the term 'Śūnyatā' in Mahāyāna Buddhism as 'emptiness.' But it is a quite wrong explanation. Because, the meaning of 'Śūnyatā' as explained in Prajñāpāramitā as well as other Mahāyāna sūtras may be translated as 'absolute unrestrictedness.' Among the Mahāsanghikas we do not find a full explanation of this and this is the reason why I called the idea of Prajñāpāramitā to be more concrete than that of the Mahāsanghikas. Nāgārjuna supplies us with a very interesting statement on this point in his Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra —

" In Śrāvaka doctrines (Hīnayāna) we have the idea of Purusa-Śūnyatā while in the Buddha vehicle (Mahāyāna) both the teachings of Puruṣa-śūnyatā as well as Dharma-śūnyatā."[2]

Again :—

" There is a two-fold Śūnyatā; namely 'Purusa-śūnyatā' and 'Dharma-śūnyatā.' 'Purusa-śūnyatā' has been preached in the Hīnayāna while 'Dharma-śūnyatā' has been preached in Mahāyāna."[3]

On the basis of Nāgārjuna's statement we came to understand that the doctrine which simultaneously dealt with the two-fold Śūnyatās belonged to Mahāyānism : while that which only dealt with one Śūnyatā should be classed as Hīnayāna. On the other hand, from a statement in Paramārtha, we also come to learn that the Mahāsanghikas, on their part too, upheld both the doctrines of 'Anātmā-adharma' and 'Śūnyapurusa-śūnyadharma.'

[1] In the Suvikrāntavikrāmi paripricchā of Prajñāpāramitā sūtra, Yuch Bundle, Vol 8, p 89B of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[2] Prajñāpāramitā śāstra, Wang Bundle, Vol I, p 29a, Chinese tripitaka

[3] Prajñāpāramitā śāstra, Wang Bundle, Vol II, p 58a of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

On the basis of this, we cannot but identify Mahāsaṅghika doctrines with those in Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras. Not only that, we can say so far, that the doctrines of Prajñāpāramitā are actually developments of Mahāsaṅgika idea.

In the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras this two-fold Śūnyatā is again explained under the following heads :—

1. Asanskṛta-śūnyatā (this principle to be applied in case of the noumenal world).

2. Sanskṛta-śūnyatā (to be applied in the case of the phenonenal world).

3. Atyanta-śūnyatā (or absolute unrestrictedness in the case of both).

We should remember that according to these Sūtras, all existence in the Universe, either noumenal or phenomenal, is Śūnyatā ; therefore, it is absolute Śūnyatā. Sometimes this three-fold Śūnyatā is explained more elaborately under eighteen heads [1] :—

1. Adhyātmaśūnyatā or Internal śūnyatā, *i.e.*, internal existence is śūnyatā.

2. Bahirdhāśūnyatā, or External śūnyatā, *i e*, external existence is śūnyatā.

3. Adhyātmabahirdhāśūnyatā, or Both the Internal and External śūnyatā, *i.e.*, both the internal and external existence are śūnyatā.

4. Śūnyatāśūnyatā, *i.e.*, The knowledge on the śūnyatā is also śūnyatā.

5. Mahāśūnyatā, or Universal śūnyatā, *i.e.*, the Universal existence is śūnyatā.

6. Paramārthaśūnyatā or Transcendental śūnyatā, *i.e.*, transcendental wisdom on the Śūnyatā of every existence is śūnyatā.

7. Sanskṛtaśūnyatā, or Phenomenal śūnyatā, *i.e.*, the existence of the phenomenal world is śūnyatā.

[1] In the Mahāprajñāpāramitā sūtra Ith Bundle, Vol I, p 7B, Chinese Tripiṭaka

8. Asanskṛtaśūnyatā, or Noumenal śūnyatā, *i.e.*, the existence of the noumenal world is śūnyatā

9. Atyantaśūnyatā, or Absolute śūnyatā.

10. Anavarāgraśūnyatā, or Limitless śūnyatā, *i.e.*, śūnyatā having no beginning and no end

11. Anavakāraśūnyatā, or Ceaseless śūnyatā.

12. Prakṛtiśūnyatā or Sabhāva śūnyatā. In an elaborate way it is called 'Buddha-sabhāva-śūnyatā,' *i.e*, the nature of Buddha, existing inherently in men, is also śūnyatā.

13. Sarvadharmaśūnyatā, or All doctrinal śūnyatā, *i.e.*, all doctrines of the Buddhas are śūnyatā.

14. Svalaksaṇaśūnyatā, or Characteristic śūnyata, *i e.*, 32 kinds of characteristics (Laksana) and 80 kinds of superior marks are śūnyatā.

15. Anupalambhaśūnyatā, or Non-acquisitional śūnyatā, *i e*, it is difficult to acquire result: so it is śūnyatā.

16. Abhāvaśūnyata, or Non-existent śūnyatā, *i.e.*, there is no such truth as 'Anātmā-adharma' doctrine to cut off men's delusion ; so it is sūnyatā.

17. Svabhāvaśūnyatā, or Existent śūnyatā, *i.e.*, 'Anātmā-adharma' doctrine can cut off men's delusion so it is śūnyatā.

18. Abhāvasvabhāvaśūnyata, or Non-existent and Existent śūnyatā.[1]

Nāgārjuna explained the idea of Śūnyatā of Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras under two heads; namely,

[1] In the Mahāprajñāpāramitā sutra, Jih Bundle, Vol I p. 7B, Chinese Tripitaka. Without elaborate explanation on these 18 kinds of Śūnyatā, it is difficult to give a clear idea of the subject, but through fear of confusion and digressions that might arise, as being inconsistent with the main subject-matter at our disposal, I leave this point to be discussed elsewhere We have in Chinese elaborate explanation on this subject in Astādaśā-śūnyatā-śāstra of Nāgārjuna Translated by Paramārtha A D 557 56 of the Chan dynasty A D 557 580 See Nanjio's Catalogue, p 262, No 1187

'Saṁvṛiti-satya' and 'Paramārtha-satya,'[1] that is to say, from the Saṁvriti or conventional point of view, all things are existing provisionally. But from the Paramārthic or transcendental point of view, all things are not existing, it is 'Atyanta-śūnyatā' or 'absolute unrestrictedness'[2]

I have thus far shown the close connection between the doctrines of Mahāsanghikas and those of Mahāyān from a 'negative point of view'

Let us see next, how far we are able to show the relation between doctrines of the said two schools (Mahāsanghikas and Mahāyāna) on the same subject from a 'Positive point of view?'

According to Paramārtha's commentary on Nikāya-avalambana-śāstra (Pu-chih-I-lum), the Lokottaravāda the third branch of the original Mahāsanghikas held .—"Worldly existence (laukika dharma) sprang from an overturned or opposite idea (viparītā mūdam). This produces suffering (kleśa), this again produces conformation[3] (samskāra) and this again produces the effect (kārya). And all productions from the overturned idea are false. Therefore, they are all untruths. But the super-world existence (uttara-laukika dharma) is the only reality."[4]

This statement suggests clearly that this school explained all cosmic existence from two points of view

[1] These two divisions of Nāgārjuna are very important, in order to express the idea of Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras So he said in the Mādhyamika śāstra .—

द्वेसत्ये समुपश्रित्य बुद्धाना धर्मदेशना ।
लोकसंवृतिसत्य च सत्य च परमार्थत: ॥"

"The teaching of Buddha is based on the two-fold truths the conventional and the transcendental" (The Mādhyamika śāstra, Chap 24, Kārika 8)

[2] Exactly the same sense is met with many times in the Prajñāpāramitā śāstra, Wang Bundle, Vol I, p 12B, Vol II, p 98B, Vol III, p 37a

[3] In Buddhist philosophy, it is capable of meaning impressions, ideas, notions, conceptions, effect of work, merit of action, etc Mrs Rhys Davids translates it as "action of the mind" somewhere else

[4] I have quoted this from San ron-gen-gi, Vol I, p 52 (in Chinese).

in two distinct terms. one is 'worldly' (laukika) and another is 'super-world' (uttara-laukika). The former is exactly the same as 'Samvrti-satya' and the latter 'Paramārtha-satya' used by Nāgārjuna, as explanatory terms of cosmic existence

From the former point of view the Lokottaravādins of the Mahāsanghika school denied all existence as false or merely provisional; but from the latter point of view, they affirmed ontologically all noumenal existence as real. The latter point of view clearly indicates that the Mahāsanghika schools, as a whole, held nearly the same idea contained in the Prajñāpāramitā and other Mahāyāna sūtras, *viz.*,—'Dharma-svabhāva-nityam'[1] (*i.e.*, the original condition of existence is permanent). This is the positive side of 'Sarva-śūnyatā' of Prajñāpāramitā and other Mahāyānic sūtras.

Now, our next question is how possibly could the Lokottaravādins of the Mahāsanghika school bring out this positive aspect of their view on noumenal existence.

In answer to this, I dare say at once that the doctrine of 'Vimala-citta-svabhāva' of original Mahāsañghika school was its source. The original Mahāsanghikas held that the original nature of the human mind is naturally pure. So it is that Vasumitra said in his Nikāyabheda-dharmamati-chakra-śāstra (or I-pu-tsun-lun-lun):—

"The nature of mind (of beings) originally is pure,[2] but it has been encumbered by suffering which did not exist originally; therefore, the mind became impure."[3] At first sight, the above statement seems to indicate of

[1] The two main Mahāsanghika schools similarly bring out almost exactly both sides of the doctrine when explaining cosmic existence The Ekavyavahārika school expresses the negative sense of 'Sarva-śūnyatā,' while the Lokottara school harps on the positive aspect contained in 'Dharma svabhāva-nityam'

[2] The 'pure mind' and 'suffering' of this doctrine, may be favourable compared with 'Purṣa' 'Prakṛiti' of Sānkhya philosophy

[3] Toyo daigaku Edition of Tokyo, p 91

eternal and endless purity of the original mind of individual beings only But a deep consideration would reveal that it is applicable not only in the case of an individual mind, but also the same holds true in the case of the universal mind (noumenal existence). The Lokottaravādins of the Mahāsaṅghika school well understood the inner idea of 'Vimala-citta-svabhāva,' and through it they sought to establish the idea of reality of 'Uttara-laukika-dharma' or 'Dharma-svabhāva-nityaṁ.' In other words, from the Pāramārthic point of view, they held that all existence in the universe is a reality without beginning, without end.

Let us, next, draw our attention to Mahāyāna doctrines. In the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras we find, on the one hand, the idea of 'Sarva-śūnyatā' as the negative explanation on the cosmic existence, while, on the other hand, we find there also the idea of 'Dharma-svabhāva-nityaṁ' which is a positive explanation on cosmic existence. Therefore, Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras stated thus :—

"Every existence (sarva-dharma) is all Śūnyatā. Therefore, there is nothing to recognize (asaṁjñā), nothing to entreat (apranihitam), nothing to produce (aunpāda), nothing to decay (aniroda). Therefore, all existence is originally calm (svabhāva-nirvāṇa). Whether the Buddha come to this world or not, such a character of all existences (Dharma-laksana) is permanent."[1]

The sense of 'Svabhāva-nirvāṇa' some times has been put in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras as 'Dharma tathatā' or 'The real characteristic of existence,' which has been termed by us as the positive side of the explanation. Be it noted, here, that the same has been fully brought out in the Upāyakauśalya-parivarta chapter of Suddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra which is rightly regarded as

[1] Chinese translation of Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra, Hoang Bundle, X, p. 60a.

the record of a complete exposition of Buddha's Introspec tional perception. There it is said —

"विदित्व बुद्धा द्विपदानमुत्तमा प्रकाशयिष्यान्ति ममेकयानम्
धर्मस्थितिं धर्मनियामतां च नित्यस्थितां लोकि इमामकम्प्याम्"[1]

"Knowing this, the Buddhas, the highest of men, shall reveal this single vehicle. They shall reveal the stability of the Dharma (existence), its being subjected to fixed rules, its unshakable perpetuity in the world."[2]

Hence Nāgārjuna: the great expounder of Māhāyana Buddhism has touched these two aspects of the doctrine—negative and positive—in his system. By the same term 'Sarva-śūnyatā' he sometimes gives the negative aspect of his Ontological explanation, and in other place he brings out the positive side.

In the beginning of Mādhyamika-śāstra[3] as well as in Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra[4] he said.—

"अनिरोधमनुत्पादमनुच्छेदमशाश्वतं।
अनेकार्थमनानार्थमनागममनिर्गमम्॥"[5]

"No annihilation, no production, no destruction, no persistence, no unity, no plurality, no coming in, no going out."

In this Kārika he has explained Ontological ideas from a negative point of view. But in his 'Dharma-dhātu-śāstra' he has said:—

"Dharma-dhātu (universe) is originally pure and permanent."[6] We also find the same expression in his Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra:—

[1] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka sūtra, Part I, p. 53

[2] S B. E., Vol XXI, p 53 Dr Kern's translation of 'Dharma' here, as 'Law' is a mistake

[3] Mādhyamika Vṛtti, Chap I, Kārika, I.

[4] Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra, Wang Bundle, Vol I, p 38a.

[5] These eight kinds of negations originally occurred in 'The sūtra of the garland of the Bodhisattva' (Yü Bundle, Vol IV, p 33b, Chinese Tripitaka) But Nāgārjuna has used these in his Mdhyamika śāstra as well as in his Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra

[6] Chang Bundle, Vol XX, p 67b (see Nanjio's catalogue, No 1070)

"Sarva dharma (all existence) is originaly pure."[1] These are expressions of the positive point of view. I think, such positive idea of Nāgārjuna undoubtedly originated from 'Vimala-citta-svabhāva,' of the Mahāsanghika school and 'Dharma-nirvāna' or 'Dharma-tathatā,' or 'Dharma-svabhāva-nityaṁ' of Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras and "Dharma sthitim dharma niyāmatām nitya stithāṁ" of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra

If we go a little further and examine Mahāyāna-śraddhotpāda-śāstra[2] of Aśvaghosa II, one of the most famous expounders of Mahāyāna doctrines flourishing in 5th century A.D., we shall find that the ideas of 'Vimala-citta-svabhāva' of Mahāsanghikas and 'Svabhāva-nityam' of Prajñāpāramitā have been clearly explained in a much more concrete form than that of Nāgārjuna. He has established the existence of a universal mind from the existence of individual sentient minds. And that universal mind is the root or foundation of all existences in the world, either phenomenon or super-phenomenon, and it is also pure and permanent. We should remember, here, that this universal mind has been called by him as 'Bhūtatathatā.' So he said :—

"What is Mahāyāna? It is the soul of all sentient beings (sarva-sattva), that constitutes all things in the world, phenomenal and super-phenomenal; and through this soul we can disclose what the Mahāyāna signifies."[3] Again,

"What is meant by the soul as suchness (bhūtatathatā), is the oneness of the totality of things (dharma-dhātu),

[1] This passage has been quoted from Prof G Umada's History of Indian Buddhism, p 256 (in Japanese)

[2] The original Sanskrit text has been lost But we have two Chinese versions, one is translated by Paramārtha (553 A D) of the Liāṅ dynasty (502—557 A D) Another is by Sikṣānanda (695—700 A D) of the Thaṅ dynasty (618—907 A D) We have also two English translations of this work one by T Suzuki, another by Rev T Richaud

[3] Mr T Suzuki's Awakening of Faith, p 53

the great all-including whole, the quintessence of the Doctrine For the essential nature of the soul is uncreate and eternal.

"All things, simply on account of our confused subjectivity (smrti), appear under the forms of individuation. If we could overcome our confused subjectivity, the signs of individuation would disappear, and there would be no trace of a world of [individual and isolated] objects.

"Therefore, all things in their fundamental nature are not nameable or explicable. They cannot be adequately expressed in any form of language. They are without the range of apperception. [They are universals.] They [things in their fundamental nature] have no signs of destination. [They are not particulars.] They possess absolute sameness (samatā) [They are universals.] They are subject neither to transformation, nor to destruction. They are nothing but the one soul, for which suchness is another designation."[1]

Again.

There is another statement which exactly identified with 'Vimala-citta' doctrine of Mahāsanghika school as following —

"While the essence of mind is eternally clean and pure, the influence of ignorance makes possible the existence of a defiled mind But in spite of the defiled mind, the mind [itself] is eternal, clear, pure, and not subject to transformation."[2]

From the above quotation, it would not probably be wrong that Aśvaghosa II's doctrine of 'Bhūtatathatā' was also based upon the idea of 'Vimala-citta-svabhāva' of Mahāsanghikas as well as 'Svabhāva-nityaṁ' of Prajñāpāramitā and Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtras, just in

[1] Mr T Suzuki's Awakening of Faith, p 55-57.

[2] Mr T Suzuki's Awakening of Faith, p 79

the same way as Nāgārjuna did. Thus, we see that the positive side of the Ontological ideas of Mahāyānism had been developed in a complete form from the time of Aśvaghosa II.

From the above discussion, we understand clearly how the doctrines of the Mahāsanghikas were connected with those of Mahāyāna sūtras in both 'negative' and 'positive' aspects But here we should not forget one thing. In the above, I have quoted some typical passages from Prajñāpāramitā and Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtras among innumerable other Mahāyāna sūtras. This is because, these two Sūtras are very important and representative among others, to present the Ontological perception of the Buddha on cosmic existences. Of these two, the latter one may be regarded as touching the vital and essential chord of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

(*b*). *The relation between the doctrine of Mahāsanghikas and that of Mahāyāna sūtras regarding the Buddha-kāya conception*

First of all, let us see, what is the Buddhalogy of Mahāsanghikas? If we look at the Nikāya-bheda-dharmamati-chakra-śāstra (or I-pu-tsun-lun-lun) of Vasumitra, we come across the following passages:—

"The fundamental and common doctrines of the Mahāsanghika, the Ekavyavahārika, the Lokottaravāda and the Kaukkutika schools:—The four schools unanimously maintained that (1) The Blessed Buddhas are all superhuman (lokottara). (2) all Tathāgatas have no worldly attributes (sāsrava-dharmas). (3) The words of Tathāgatas are all (about) the 'Turning of the Wheel of Law' (Dharma-chakrapravartana). (4) Buddha preaches all doctrines (dharmas) with one utterance. (5) In the teachings of Bhagavān (Buddha) there is nothing that is not in accordance with the truth.

(6) The physical body (rūpa-kāya) of Tathāgata is limitless. (7) The majestic powers of Tathāgata also are limitless. (8) Lives of Buddhas, too are limitless. (9) Buddha is never tired of enlightening living beings and awakening pure faith in them, etc."[1]

The above quotation shows clearly that the conception of Mahāsanghikas regarding the Buddha-kāya is quite different from that of Sthaviravādins, upholders of Original form of Buddhism, as well as of its offshoots Sarvāstivādins who, we know, hold only Buddhalogy of Rūpa-kāya (or historical Buddha). But, from Vasumitra's statements quoted above, we easily observed that the idea of 'Dharma-kāya Buddha' and 'Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha' have already been manifested in the Mahāsanghika schools Besides Vasumitra's work, the Mahāvastu, a book of Vinaya of Lokottaravādin school of Mahāsnghika, also embodies the same conception of Buddha-kāya. Professor L De la Vallée Pouesin said in his learned article thus —

"The 'Buddhalogy' of Mahāvastu marks a stage between the conception of Buddha as a simple mortal (Little vehicle) and that of Buddha as a quasi-eternal god sending illusory images down to this world (Great-vehicle). The Buddha of the Mahāvastu is a superman. He feels neither hunger nor thirst; he lives in ignorance of carnal desires; his wife remains a virgin. It is from consideration for humanity, in order to conform to the customs of the world (lokānuvartanā), that he behaves as a man, or that he gives to men the false impression that he is behaving as a man. In technical terms, he is lokottara, 'superior to the world.'"[2]

Next, let us look at the Avatamsaka-sūtras, regarded as one of the most important Mahāyāna sutras, and these

[1] See Journal of Letters of Calcutta University, Vol I, pp 7-8

[2] E R E, Vol 8, p 329

originated, from my point of view, as early as the time of Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras. These Sūtras, as a whole, deal with Buddha's Ontological perceptions just in the same light as other Mahāyāna sūtras do. But the special features of these are to indicate Buddha's Introspectional perception on the Buddha-kāya and Human life more definitely than that of the cosmic existence. There we find the following passages regarding the Buddha-kāya :—

"Tathāgata is all-prevailing in the Universe (Dharma Dhātu)."[1]

Again,

"Buddha-kāya is visible everywhere in ten directions."[2]

Again,

"The Dharma-kāya of the Tathāgata is extensive."[3]

Again,

"Even single utterance of Tathāgata is immeasureable"[4]

Again,

"Even single utterance of the Tathāgata is without measure."[5]

Again,

Buddha-kāya pervades all through the Dharma-dhātu and it manifests itself before all human beings."[6]

Again,

"One body of Buddha (Buddha-kāya) reveals numberless bodies."[7]

[1] Avatamsaka-sūtra Tien Bundle, Vol. I, p 6a of Chinese Tripitaka

[2] *Ibid* Tien Bundle, Vol I, p 6a

[3] *Ibid* Tien Bundle, Vol I, p 7b

[4] *Ibid* Tien Bundle, Vol. I, pp 8a and 15a.

[5] *Ibid* Tien Bundle, Vol I, p 22a

[6] *Ibid* Tien Bundle, Vol I p 25b

[7] *Ibid* Tien Bundle Vol I pp 76a and 82a

Again,

"The magnificent body of Tathāgata prevails everywhere in the Dharma-dhātu, therefore, without changing the seat he prevails in all places."[1]

Again,

"The Tathāgata, the Supreme Perfect Enlightenment, is always staying in calm and immovable condition, yet he reveals himself everywhere in the world of ten directions."[2]

Again,

"Any one willing to admire the limitless and wonderful body of the Tathāgata, would not be able to do so even in the unlimited Kalpaḥ."[3]

Again,

"By one utterance (Buddha) preaches, innumerable teachings and at the same time by innumerable utterances (Buddha) preaches simple teaching."[4]

Such conception of Buddhalogy is found everywhere throughout the whole Avatamsaka-sūtra, and this Mahāyānic conception of Buddhalogy fully developed as a last stage in the Tathāgatāyusapramāna-parivarta of the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra Throughout the whole chapter Buddha tries to explain to men that he has not newly been a Buddha but was such through eternity; so he said :—

अचिन्तिया कल्पसहस्रकोट्यो यासां प्रमाणं न कदाचि विद्यते ।
प्राप्ता मया एष तदाग्रबोधिर्धर्मं च देशेम्यहु नित्यकालम् ॥
समादपेमी बहुबोधिसत्त्वान्बौधस्मि ज्ञानस्मि स्थपेमि चैव ।
सत्त्वान कोटीनयुताननेकान्परिपाचयामी बहुकल्पकोट्यः ॥
निर्वाणभूमिं चुपदर्शयमि विनयार्थ सत्त्वान वदाम्युपायम् ।
न चापि निर्वाम्यहु तस्मि काले इहैव चो धर्मु प्रकाशयमि ॥"[5]

[1] Tien Bundle, Vol I, p 83a of Chinese Tripitaka

[2] Tien Bundle, Vol II, p 10b

[3] *Ibid*, Vol. I, p 84b,

[4] *Ibid*, Vol XI, p 14a

[5] Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra, Part IV, p 323, No 1 2 3.

"1. An inconceivable number of thousands of koṭis of æons, never to be measured, is it since I reached superior (or first) enlightenment and never ceased to teach the law.

"2. I roused many Bodhisattvas and established them in Buddha-knowledge. I brought myriads of kotis of beings, endless, to full ripeness in many kotis of æons.

"3. I show the place of extinction, I reveal to (all) beings a device to educate them albeit I do not become extinct at the time and in this very place continue preaching the law."[1]

From a perusal of what is stated above we are surprised at the striking tone of identification between the Mahāsanghīka school and Mahāyānism regarding the conception of Buddhalogy

The so-called Three-kāya doctrine of Nāgārjuna, Maitreyanātha, Asamga, Vasubandhu and Aśvaghoṣa II is mainly based upon the Avatamsaka-sūtras and said chapter of Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra

Here, one thing we should bear in mind that among the Mahāyāna sūtras, specially Avatamsaka sūtras and said chapter of Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra were the only statements in which Buddha's Introspectional perception regarding his 'own personality' as well as 'human life' are fully expressed That is to say, there Buddha has explained his perception on the reality of human life (or the solution of the question 'What is man?') through his own Buddha-like personality which has no beginning, no end.

To sum up · the doctrines of the Mahāsanghika schools regarding the cosmic existence and Buddhalogy have been identified with that of Mahāyānism on the same conceptions. In other words, the doctrine of the Mahāsanghikas on the cosmic existence has been identified with

[1] S B E, XXI, p 307

that of the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras and the Upāyakauśalya-parivarta of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra. And at the same time, the doctrine of the Mahāsanghikas on the Buddha-kāya has been identified with that of Avataṁsaka-sūtra and the Tathāgatāyusapramāṇa-parivarta of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra.

Thus, from the internal investigation, it has been clearly shown that both the Mahāsanghika doctrines and the doctrines of Mahāyānism are identical. It can also be proved that Mahāyāna Buddhism is nothing but simply a developed form of the Mahāsanghika doctrines. From my point of view, the Mahāyāna doctrines which have been manifested in Mahāyāna sūtra forms, *have been coined by the men of the Mahāsanghika school.* Because, those Mahāyāna sūtras are, it can be said, the records of Buddha's Introspectional perceptions. However, such perceptions could not assume form except through human agency, *viz.*, advanced disciples or men like those of the Mahāsanghika schools. Here a flood of light is thrown on the most important question '*The origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism,*' because we have already seen that, from historical point of view, Mahāyāna Buddhism originated in the Mahāsanghika doctrines, but from the doctrinal point of view, Mahāyāna doctrine originated in the Buddha's perceptions.

III.—(a) The relation between the idea of Buddha's Introspectional perception and the doctrine of Mahāyāna sūtras regarding the cosmic existence.

Now, let us see what relation can be found between the idea of Buddha's Ontological perception and the doctrines of Mahāyāna sūtras regarding the cosmic existence, in order to make clear the point, that the doctrines of Mahāyāna sūtras are nothing but only manifestation of Buddha's Introspectional perception

regarding Ontology. And at the same time we shall understand also that the Mahāyāna doctrines, as ideas, existed originally in Buddha's Introspectional perceptions since the time of his Enlightenment

The moment when Buddha attained the Enlightenment he obtained absolute truth. That very moment he understood also the external aspect of the world—the condition of this External world or 'Saṁsāra'—as well as the real condition of Internal world or real state of the world. From that very moment, the man Siddhārtha, the son of Suddhodana, became the Buddha He was no more an ordinary man but the 'Jina of all' (Sabbābibhū), the 'Knower of all' (Sabbavidū)[1] He was no more the son of Suddhodana but the father of the whole world.[2]

The absolute truth which he obtained, was the truth of the 'cosmic existence' Because, without the cosmic existence no truth can exist Of it there are naturally two aspects one is the truth on the 'external,' another is 'internal' So, there must be two aspects also in that absolute truth itself one is the 'truth on the external world,' another is the 'truth on the internal world' As soon as Buddha obtained that absolute truth, two kinds of perceptions on the two aspects of the said truth dawned upon him—the one the 'external aspect' according to me is Buddha's Phenomenological perception, while the other the 'internal aspect' is Buddha's Ontological perception.

But, as a matter of fact, the time and the social circumstances in India at that time, allowed him to

[1] Sabbābhibhū sabbavidū', hamasmi, M N, Vol I, pp 171, 227 and A N IV, p 23

[2] "Eko, mhi sammāsambuddho," M N, Vol I, p 171, again, "त्रैधातुकं च ममेदं परिग्रहो ये स्वत्र दह्यन्ति ममेति पुत्रा" (Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Part I, p 90).

"This triple world is my domain and those who in it are suffering from burning heat are my sons" (S B E, XXI, p. 88)

preach the doctrine only by his Phenomenological perception. Therefore, as I have already stated, he hesitated to reveal his Ontological perception to the mass. We know this also, that his Phenomenology had been preached in his lifetime through 'Four noble truths' and among them he has dealt chiefly and minutely with 'Suffering' (duḥkha) and 'Its-cause' (duḥkha-samudaya). Again, in order to make clear the former, he laid special stress upon what we call 'Threefold-doctrine,' namely: 'All is impermanent' (sarvam-anityaṁ), 'All is suffering' (sarvaṁ-duḥkham), and 'All is without ego' (sarvam-anātmam) And as regards the latter he dwelt upon what is called 'Twelve-linked chain of causation' (dvādasa-pratītya-samutpāda) The 'path' leading to its extinction' (Duhkha-nirodha-mārga) has also been pointed out by the enumeration of the 'Eightfold noble-path' but he did not try to explain 'Its suppression' (duḥkha-nirodha) or in other word 'Nirvāna' fully and well.

Because, though it bears a negative sense, yet it suggests an Ontological idea And if he tried to deal minutely with this point, just in the same way as he did with the other three points, he would have to explain fully his Introspectional perception on Ontology which, however, was not favourable to the time and social condition then existing. This is the reason, I think, why his explanation on the 'Nirvāna' was very scanty. In a word, Buddha, in his lifetime, has only shown to people the 'way to salvation' but not the real stage of salvation itself which he realised through his Introspectional perception Of course as a matter of fact, this 'way to salvation' is the most important matter from religious standpoint. Because, without this, men can never realize themselves. And again, without such realization, they cannot obtain true perception and real salvation.

This is the very reason why Buddha's movement is regarded as the most important one and the most excellent religious revolution India has ever seen. From my point of view, Buddha's movemnt gave a new life and new light to India's religious thought. Therefore, it is not wrong to hold that his movement was the real centre in the history of India's religious and philosophical thought. However, from the point of Buddha's Introspectional perception, this Phenomenological doctrine was only a means or expedient doctrine (upāya-dharma) but not the reality itself. Here, a difficult question may arise: if Buddha's original teachings or doctrines mainly dealt with the Phenomenological perception, how then can we understand his Introspectional and Ontological doctrine upon the cosmic existence, etc. Of course, there is no positive and external statements regarding this point except a ratiocination. Therefore, if cosmic existences, from the point of view of Buddha's Phenomenological perception, are 'Impermanent,' and 'Suffering,' and 'Without ego,' then from the Ontological point of view which is quite opposite of the former, they should be 'Permanent' 'Happy,' and 'With a great ego,' —indicated throughout the Mahāyāna-mahaparinirvāna-sūtra.[1] And the following statment of Saddharma-puṇḍarika-sūtra is the exact indication of Buddha's Ontological perception on cosmic existence:

"धर्मस्थितिं धर्मनियामतां च नित्यस्थितां लोकि इमामकम्पाम् ।"[2]

[1] There are two kinds of Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtras in the Chinese translation of the tripiṭaka, one deals with Buddha's parinirvāna, this may be called Hīnayānic Mahāparinirvāna sūtra corresponding with the Mahāparinibbāna-sutra in Dīgha-Nikāya of the Pāli canon (see Nanjio's catalogue, p 136, No 545 and p 139, No 552) The other belongs to the Mahāyāna sūtra Though its title is the same with that of the Pāli D N and its manner of writing is also about the same, that is to say, the teachings have been imparted by Buddha just before his parinirvāna for future's sake, yet the idea contained in the Sūtra is quite different from that of the Pāli D N. because, it deals with Buddha's Ontological perception on the cosmic existence as well as human life (See Nanjio's catalogue, p 39, No 114, etc.)

[2] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka sutra Part I, p 53

"They shall reveal the stability of the Dharma, its being subjected to fixed rules, its unshakeable perpetuity in the world." [1]

In the Original form of Buddhism, there is no positive statement on such Ontological idea on cosmic existence as I have told before However, we find references to such ideas in negative sense scattered throughout the Pāli Nikāyas which are regarded as embodying statements much akin to the Original Buddhism

In the Saṁyutta-Nikāya it has been stated :—

> "Yattha kho āvuso na jāyati na jīyati na mīyati na cavati na uppajjati, nāham tam gamanena lokassa antam ñāteyyam dattheyyaṁ patteyyan-ti vadāmīti" [2]

"Where, friend, one does not get born, nor grow old, nor die, nor leave one sphere for another, nor get reborn :—that end of the world, I say, thou art not able by walking to come to know, nor to see, nor to arrive at." [3]

In the Anguttara-Nikāya also we find the same statement as above [4]

Again, in the Samyutta-Nikāya :—

> "Yattha āpo ca pathavī tejo vāyo na gādhati, ato sarā nivattanti, ettha vattam na vattati, ettha nāmañca rūpañca, asesam uparujjhatīti" [5]

> "Where the four elements that cleave, and stretch,
> And burn, and move no further footing find
> Hence ebb the flooding tides, here whirls no more.
> The whirlpool, here to utter ending comes
> This compound thing of body and of mind"

[1] S. B E, Vol XVI, p 53

[2] S N, Part I, p 61 (S N 2 3 6)

[3] The Book of the Kindred Sayings by Mrs Rhys Davids, , Part I, p 85

[4] A N, Part, II, p 48 (A N IV 15)

[5] S N, Part, I, p 15 (1 3 7)

[6] The Book of the Kindred Sayings, Part I, p 23

This passage, according to me may be rendered thus —**As water, earth, fire and air have no firm footing, so do the tides ebb and flow (i e., have no firm footing), etc.**

Again, in the Udāna :—

"Atthi bhikkhave tad āyatanam, yattha n'eva pathavī na āpo na tejo na vāyo na ākāsānañcāyatanaṁ .. n'āyam loko na paraloko ubho candimasūriyā, tad aham bhikkhave n eva āgatim vadāmi na gatim na thitiṁ na cutiṁ na upapattiṁ, appatitthaṁ appavattam anārammanam eva tam. es' ev' anto dukkhassā'ti." [1]

"There is, O monks, a sphere where there is neither earth, nor water, nor heat, nor air, nor the endless atmosphere . neither this world, nor another world, none of the sun and the moon ; therefore, O monks, do I say that it is neither coming nor going, nor staying, nor sleeping, nor arising, but that it is unstable, unchanging, without any support This, verily, is the end of suffering." [2]

Again, in the same Udāna .—

"Yattha āpo ca pathavī vāyo na gādhati,
na tattha sukkā jotanti, ādicco nappakāsati,
na tattha candimā bhāti, tamo tattha na vijjati,
yadāca attanāvedi muni monena brāhmaṇo,
atha rūpā arūpā ca sukha dukkhā pamuccatīti " [3]

"Where water, earth, heat or air enters not, the stars do not gleam there, nor does the sun shine, nor the moon and darkness exists not When the Brahmana becomes a sage by silent meditation and realises his own self, he becomes quit of form and formless-ness, of happiness and suffering." [2]

Again, in the Dīgha-Nikāya ·—

"Viññāṇam anidassanam anantaṁ sabhatopahaṁ,
Ettha āpo ca pathavī tejo vāyo na gādhati.

[1] Udāna, VIII I
[2] Translated by my colleague Mr Sailendranath Mitra, M.A
[3] Udāna, I, p 9.

Ettha dīghañca rassañca anum thulaṁ subhāsubhaṁ,
Ettha nāmañca rūpañca asesam uparujjhati,
Viññāṇassa nirodheno etth'etaṁ uparujjhatīti."[1]

"The intellect of Arahatship, the invisible, the endless accessible from every side .—

'There is it that earth, water, fire and wind,
And long and short, and fine and coarse,
Pure and impure, no footing find
Die out, leaving no trace behind.
When intellection ceases they all also cease.'[2]

Therefore, the sense of 'Nirvāṇa' in the Original form of Buddhism is 'incomposite' (asankhata), 'unweakened' (ajajjara), 'stable' (dhuva), 'eternal' (amata). So, it should be 'peaceful' (khema) as well as 'calm' (santa); then it must be 'final' (parāyana) and 'true' (sacca).[3] So, we should not think that 'Nirvāṇa' is extinction of something, but eternal reality of cosmic existence, which is really difficult for human language to express in the positive sense. Moreover, in the Phenomenological

[1] D N, Vol I, p 223 (D N II Kevaddha)

[2] Dialogues of the Buddha by Rhys Davids, Part I, pp 413 484

It is very interesting to state here that the idea of Buddha's Ontological perception in negative aspects on Nirvāna, as stated above, corresponds exactly with that of some Upanishad is In the Katha, V, 16, Mundaka, II, 2, 10, and Śvetāśvatara, VI, 14, the following passage is recorded —

"न तत्र सूर्य्यो भाति, न चन्द्र तारकं.
नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति, कुतोऽयमग्निः ?
तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं,
तस्य भासा सर्वमिद विभाति ।'

The idea as well as the mode of expression are exactly the same as noted above In the Upanishadas this mode of expression indicates the stage of 'absolute Brahman' while in Buddha's point of view, it indicates the state of Nirvāna From a perusal of such identical expressions as we come across in both, we may hold that in a certain sense Buddha's Ontological perception on the 'cosmic existence' as well as on 'human life' does not surpass the ideas of the Upanishads But the difference between them is the different way of realization, that is to say, the way of realization of Upanishadas is philosophical, while Buddha's way is a religious one.

[3] S N, Part IV, pp 369-373 (Asaukhatam)

doctrine of Buddha (original form of Buddhism), it was not his aim to deal with the positive aspect of Nirvāṇa. This is why Buddha used simply the term Nirvāṇa from the negative point of view. So it is said in the Udāna :—

"No ce tam bhikkhave abhavissa ajātam abhūtam akatam asankhatam nayidha jātassa bhūtassa katassa saṅkhatassa nissaranam paññāyetha ? "[1]

"If, O monks, that were not unborn, non-existent, not made, not compounded, would not the dissolution of the existent, the made, the compounded be comprehensible ? "[2]

Again, in the Kathāvatthu :—

"Sabba-dhammānam tathatā asankhatā, nibbānam tāṇam, lenam, saranam, parāyanam, accutam, amatam nibbānam, asankhatam "[3]

"Nibbāna is the deliverance, the safety, the refuge, the highest path, the stability, the eternal cessation, the unfathomable."

So, it can, unmistakably, be held that the sense of 'Nirvāṇa' is consistent with the negative aspect of Buddha's Ontological perception Here we should bear in mind one thing which is of vital importance in understanding Buddha's doctrines as well as Developed form of Buddhism—that whenever Ontological ideas are expressed in the negative way, it is always done by the denial of all phenomenological existence, the case of 'Nirvāṇa' here is also the same. Such expression is found not only in the Buddhism but also in Vedantism, wherein 'Nirguna Brāhmana' has been expressed always in the negative by the term 'neti neti neti' Thus the Ontological aspect in the Original form of Buddhism is

[1] Udāna VIII, 3, and Iti-vuttaka. 43

[2] Translated by my colleague, Mr. Sailendranath Mitra, M.A.

[3] Kathāvatthu, Vol II, p. 583.

found always in the state of denying or annihilating phenomenological existence. So it is said in the Suttanta :—

"Ye te suttantā Tathāgatā bhāsitā gambhīrā gambhīratthā lokuttarā suññattapatisaṁyuttā, tesu bhaññamānesu na sussissanti, na sotaṁ odahissanti, na aññācittaṁ upatthāpessanti, na ca te dhammaṁ uggahetabbaṁ pariyāpunitabbaṁ maññissanti "[1]

"Those suttantas uttered by the Tathāgata, deep, deep in meaning, not of the world, dealing with the void, to these when uttered, they will not listen, they will not lend a ready ear, they will not bring to them an understanding heart, they will not deem those doctrines that which should be learnt by heart, that which should be mastered."[2]

So, it is not strange that in the time of Buddha, Nigrodha paribbājaka used to designate Buddha's doctrine by the term 'Suññagara-hatā-pñña' or 'the perception in the wisdom of emptiness.'[3]

Now we find that in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras, such negative aspect of Buddha's Ontological perception is clearly expressed. The idea of 'Sanskrit-śūnyatā,' 'Asanskrita-śūnyatā' and 'Atyanta-śūnyatā,' embodied therein, is nothing but concrete explanation of Buddha's Ontological perception in the negative. This point has been clearly pointed out in the Mādhyamika-śāstra by Nāgārjuna who was the systemizer of the sūtra thus :—

"निवृत्तमभिधातव्यं निवृत्ते चित्तगोचरे।
अनुत्पन्नानिरुद्धा हि निर्वाणमिव धर्मता॥"[1]

"The real state of dharma is like Nirvāṇa, indescribable, incomprehensible, without birth or death, it is

[1] S N, Part II, p 267
[2] The Book of the Kindred Sayings, II, p. 179
[3] D N, Vol III, p 38 Udumbarika Sīhanāda suttanta.
[1] Mādhyamika-śāstra, chap XVIII, karika 7.

beyond the reach of thought or language for it is absolute."

The Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras themselves, as we know, deal with Buddha's Ontological perception. This can be understood even from the meaning of the term 'Prajñapāramitā.' Etymologically, 'Prajñāpāramita' means the highest or the absolute wisdom of Buddha (which he obtained under the Bodhi-tree). Of course Buddha's perception has bearing on two aspects—negative and positive—as has been referred to, many times, in the previous discussion. The 'Śūnyatā' idea of the Prajñāpāramitā is its negative aspect while the 'Dharmatathatā' idea of it is the positive one.[1] However, the main treatment of the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras was concerned with the exposition of the negative aspect of Buddha's Ontological perception. And the Mādhyamika doctrine of Nāgārjuna is the systematized doctrine of this negative idea.

Now, it is clear enough from the above statements, that Buddha's Ontological perception on the cosmic existence can be identified with the Mahāyāna doctrine or the Developed form of Buddhism in the negative aspect. Nay, we venture to go a step further and say that both the said ideas are not only identical but originally they were one and the same in the Buddha's perception.

Our next enquiry, then, is to find out the relation between Buddha's Ontological perception and the doctrine of the Mahāyāna sūtras so far as their positive aspect is concerned.

[1] The positive aspect of Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras or Buddha's Ontological perception has been clearly and fully expressed in concrete form in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra. The Prajñāpāramitā sūtras themselves attempt to make us understand the existence of the positive aspect of Buddha's Ontological perception While the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka sūtra attempts not only to make us understand its existence but at the same time realize it in our life

As we know from the above discussion, in the Original form of Buddhism, speaking generally, Buddha expressed his Ontological ideas in the negative But occasionally, we came across even certain positive aspect of his Ontological idea in the Pāli Nikāyas. For example, in the Samyutta Nikāya :—

Ekāyano ayam maggo sattānam visuddhiyā, sokaparidevānam samatikkamāya dukkhadomanassānam atthangamāya ñāyassādhigamāya nibbānassa sacchikiriyāya .. ..." [1]

"There is the one way to this path which exists for the purification of beings, for the overcoming of grief and lamentation, for doing away with sorrow and dejection, for the attainment of the knowable and the realisation of Nibbāna." [2]

Again, in the same Nikāya —

"Jātipaccayā bhikkhave jarāmaranam, uppādā vā Tathāgatānam anuppādā vā Tathāgatānam, thitā vā sā dhātu dhammatthitatā dhammaniyāmatā idapaccayatā, taṁ Tathāgato abhisambujjhati, abhisameti, abhisambujjhitvā abhisametvā ācikkhati, deseti paññāpeti, patthapeti vivarati vibhajati uttānīkaroti passatāti cāha." [3]

"Conditioned by rebirth is decay and death. .... whether, Brethren, there be an arising of Tathāgatas, or whether there be no such arising, in each this nature of things just stands, this casual status, this casual orderliness, the relatedness of this to that Concerning that the Tathāgata is fully Enlightened, that he fully understands Fully Enlightened, fully understanding he declares it, teaches it, reveals it, sets it forth, manifests, explains, makes it plain, saying; Buddha! Conditioned by this, that comes to be." [4]

[1] S. N., Part V, pp 167, 185, and A. N., III, p 314

[2] Translated by my colleague, Mr Sailendranath Mitra, M.A

[3] S. N., Part II, p 25

[4] The Books of the Kindred Sayings, II, p 21.

This idea is exactly the same with that of 'Dharma-tathatā' as expressed throughout the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras, which reveals the expression of the positive aspect of the doctrine. We find, moreover, in one of the same sūtras the following passage :—

"Every existence (sarva-dharma) is 'all śūnyatā.' Therefore, there is nothing to recognize (asaṁjñā), nothing to entreat (apramahitam), nothing to produce (anuppādo), nothing to decay (anirodha). Therefore, all existence is originally calm (svabhāva-nirvāna). Whether the Buddha come to this world or not, such a character of all existences (Dharma-lakṣana) is permanent."[1]

At the very sight of the above passage, we can understand how exactly the idea expressed in it corresponds to that of the above quoted Nikāya passages? However, the positive idea of the Ontological perception has been fully manifested in the Saddharmapuṇdarīka-sūtra. So the Upāyakauśalya-parivarta of the same sūtra states :—

"धर्मस्थितिं धर्मनियामतां च नित्यस्थितं लोकि इमामकम्प्याम् ।"[2]

"The stability of the Dharma, its being subjected to fixed rule, its unshakable perpetuity in the world."[3]

The idea expressed here is exactly the same as that of Saṁyutta-Nikāya and the Prajñāpāramitā passages, quoted above. But more complete expression of it is found in the Tathāgatāyuspramāṇa-parivarta in the Saddharma-puṇdarīka-sūtra :—

"यदापि सत्त्वा इम लोकधातुं पश्यन्ति कल्पेन्ति च दह्यमानम् ।
तदापि चेदं मम बुद्धक्षेत्रं परिपूर्ण भोती मरुमानुषाणाम् ॥
क्रीडा रती तेष विचित्र भोति उद्यानप्रासादविमानकोट्यः ।
प्रतिमण्डितं रत्नमयैश्च पर्वतैः द्रुमैस्तथा पुष्पफलैरुपेतैः ॥

[1] Chinese translation of Mahāprajñāpāramitā sūtra, Hoang Bundle, Vol. X. p. 60, of Chinese Tripitaka

[2] Saddharmapuṇdarīka-sūtra, Part I, p 53.

[3] S. B. E, Vol XVI, p- 53

उपरिं चदेवा ऽभिहनन्ति तूर्यान् मन्दारवर्षं च विसर्जयन्ति ।
ममैव अभ्योकिरि श्रावकांश्च ये चान्य बोधाविह प्रस्थिता विदू ॥
एवं च मे क्षेत्रमिदं सदा स्थितं अन्ये च कल्पेन्तिम दह्यमानम् ।" [1]

"When creatures behold this world and imagine that it is burning, even then my Buddha-field is teeming with gods and men.

"They dispose of manifold amusements, koṭis of pleasure gardens, palaces, and aerial cars; (this field) is embellished by hills of gems and by trees abounding with blossoms and fruits.

"And aloft gods are striking musical instruments and pouring a rain of Mandāras by which they are covering me, the disciples and other sages who are striving after enlightenment.

"So in my field here, everlasting; but others fancy that it is burning." [2]

Again, in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtras which are regarded as belonging to a later composition in consideration of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra and Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras, this positive Ontological perception of Buddha assumes concrete form in the terms 'Nitya' or permanent, 'sukha' or happy and 'Âtma' or Ego, as opposed to the terms 'Anitya' 'Duḥkha' and 'Anātma' of the Original form of Buddhism.

Thus, the Buddha's Ontological perception on cosmic existence has been proved clearly to bear a close identity with the doctrine of Mahāyāna sūtras so far as positive sense is concerned.

(b) *The relation between the Buddha's Ontological perception upon his own personality and Mahāyāna Buddhalogy.*

The Buddha's Ontological perception on the cosmic existence and its relation with the doctrine of Mahāyāna

[1] Saddharmapundarīka sūtra, pp 324-5

[2] S B E, Vol XXI, pp. 308-9

sūtras have been discussed above. Our duty now will be to see what relation can be found between Buddha's Ontological perception on his 'own personality' and Mahāyāna 'Buddhalogy.' Before proceeding with the discussion, we should bear in mind, that from the Buddha's standpoint, there is no Buddhalogy. For, so-called Buddhalogy pertains to Buddha's personality itself. And his perception on his own personality turned out later on to be 'Buddhalogy' among his desciples.

As we know from the scriptures, the culminating moment of his meditation is the moment of the solution of questions regarding the truth of reality and at the same time the moment of the attainment of the said truth is the moment of Buddha's Enlightenment. At that very moment he obtained not only ontological perception upon cosmic existence, but at the same time he understood the real characteristic of his own personality. Thereupon, the man Siddhārtha, the son of Suddhodana discovered himself no more as such, but as father of all no more as such ordinary human being but the 'Jina of all' (sabbābhibhū), the 'Knower of all' (sabbavidū). So it is said in the Suttanta:—

> "Sabbābhibhū sabbavidū'ham asmi.
> Sabbesu dhammesu anupalitto.
> Sabbañjaho taṇhakkhaye vimutte.
> Sayamabhiññāya kam uddiseyyam."[1]

"I am the all-conqueror, the all-knower, I am free from all conditions, I have left all, and am emancipated through the destruction of desire. Having attained to supreme wisdom by my own self, whom shall I point out (as my teacher)."

[1] M. N, Vol I., p 176

This is because, at that very moment he himself found the truth, so it is said in the Nikāya :—

"Dhammam hi so bhikkhu passati.
Dhammaṁ passanto mam passati "[1]

" One who understands the dhamma, also understands me and one who understands me, also understands dhamma."

The said absolute truth is eternal. Therefore, from the above quotation it is clear that as soon as Buddha discovered himself harmonized with Dharma or absolute truth, that very moment, through his Introspectional perception he realised for the first time, his own personality also to be eternal, having no beginning and no end (anādi-ananta). Over and above that perception he also, at that very moment, penetrated into the truth that he was originally possessed of Buddha-hood. The idea of the oneness of both Buddha and Dharma is the basis of the conception of 'Dharma-kāya Buddha' and the historical Buddha, thereby, becomes the 'Nirmāna-kāya Buddha' and finally these two combined together from what is called the 'Sambhoga-kāya Buddha.'

Regarding the Buddhalogy of Mahāyānism we have already entered into a discussion where the relation between the Mahāsanghika and Mahāyāna sūtra conception upon the Buddha-kāya has been dealt with. So it is needless to re-state it fully here again. However, in order to make clear the point in issue a slight touch should be made.

As we know, in the Mahāsanghika Buddhalogy the 'Tri-kāya' conception already existed in the bud and it began to bloom in the Avataṁsaka-sūtras and fully blossomed into flower in the Tathāgatāyuṣpramāṇa

[1] Itivuttaka, 92 (p. 91)

parivarta of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra. So it has been said here :—

"कुलपुत्रास्तथागतेन कर्तव्यं तत्तथागत करोति। तावच्चिराभिसंबुद्धोऽपरिमितायुष्प्रमाणं तथागतः सदा स्थित। अपरिनिर्वृतस्तथागतः परिनिर्वाणमादर्शयति वैनेयवशेन।"[1]

"The Tathāgata then, young men of good family, does what he has to do The Tathāgata who so long ago was perfectly Enlightened is unlimited in the duration of his life, he is everlasting Without being extinct, the Tathāgata makes a show of extinction, on behalf of those who have to be educated."[2]

Thus, we arrive at a clear identification between the Buddha's perception on his own personality and Mahāyāna Buddhalogy.

IV.—Inter-relation among the Buddha's Ontological perception and doctrines of the Mahāsanghikas as well as of Mahāyāna sūtras regarding human life and their points of agreement

In the previous sections II and III, we have dealt with the relation subsisting between the Buddha's Ontological perception and the conception of Mahāsanghika schools as well as that of Mahāyāna sūtras regarding cosmic existence and Buddhalogy. And there we have also pointed out their agreement

In this section, we shall have to discuss the conception of the 'human life' as they exist in the Buddha's Ontological perception, doctrines of Mahāsanghika school as well as that of Mahāyāna sūtras

The conception of 'human life' might have been explained in connection with the discussion of cosmic existence and Buddhalogy as noticed above. Because

[1] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra Part IV, pp 318 319

[2] S B E., XVI, p 302

the 'human life' is one of cosmic existences and conception of the same had already been revealed in the Buddha's Ontological perception through his personality as well as in Mahāyāna Buddhalogy.

However, I kept silence on this point in cause of my previous discussions through fear of digressions. Therefore, I denote this special section in order to make the point clear.

First of all, we should bear in mind that the conception of 'human life' is one of the most important problems in Buddhism. This is because every religion and philosophy owes their origin in the question of 'What is man'? Though there are many other ultimate questions as such —What is the world? What connection has the man with the world? Why man is born in the world? What is the instinct of man? What is the destiny of man? Yet the question 'What is man?' is the most important one, for all other questions have a principal bearing upon it; because had there been no men on earth, why then other question would arise? So this question must be solved first, and with its solution, all other questions may be solved automatically. Therefore, it is no exaggeration to say that all the sages of India and other countries had been engaged in solving this question. Such was the case with Buddha also and his disciples. This is the reason why we attach much importance to this point. Moreover, the three problems regarding 'cosmic existence,' 'Buddhalogy' and 'human life' are of vital importance among the early eighteen schools of Buddhism and those of Mahāyāna schools And difference of opinions regarding these problems was the main cause of their separation.

Let us see, first, what was Buddha's Ontological perception on the 'human life' As we know, at the moment of Buddha's Enlightenment, he himself discovered

that he was no more an ordinary man but the Enlightened Buddha not only that, but at the same time he found his personality having no beginning, no end and even that he was originally Buddha Such perception he obtained through the absolute truth. And again through this truth along with his Introspectional perception he also realised that all human lives too originally possessed Buddha-hood. If all human beings had not the germ of Buddha-hood, then it would have been quite impossible for human Siddhārtha to attain Buddha-hood and there would also have been no way by which men could attain that Buddha-hood. The idea is like that of potatoes which can never produce rice and of rice which can never become potato.

So, it has been stated in the Dīgha-Nikāya :—

" Buddho so Bhagavā bodhāya dhammam deseti,
Danto „ „ damathāya „ „
Santo „ „ samathāya „ „
Tiṇṇo „ „ taraṇāya „ „
Parinibbuto „ parinibbānāya „ „ [1]

" Enlightened is the Exalted One; he teaches the religion of Enlightenment. Self-mastered is the Exalted One; he teaches the religion of Self-mastery. Calm is the Enlightened One ; he teaches the religion of Calm. Saved is the Enlightened One; he teaches the religion of Salvation. At peace is the Enlightened One; he teaches the religion of Peace." [2]

If human beings had not possessed the germ of the Enlightenment, then what was the necessity of Buddha to preach Enlightenment for them. Therefore, from the above statement, it can be held beyond doubt that the conception on the 'human life' in the Buddha's

[1] D N, Vol 55 (udumbarika)
[2] Dialogues of the Buddha, Part 3, pp. 49-50.

Ontological perception was that of human beings possessing originally Buddha-hood. More concrete form of the same idea can be found in the Saṁyutta-Nikāya:—
"Yec' abbhatītā sambuddhā ye ca Buddhā anāgatā, yo c' etarahi sambuddho bahunnaṁ sokanāsano.

Sabbe saddhammagaruno vihamsu viharanti ca.

Atho pi viharissanti, esā Buddhāna dhammatā."[1]

"Those perfectly Awakened Ones that are past, the Enlightened Ones that have not been, and he that has become perfectly Awakened now, the dispeller of the misery of the many, all these preceptors of the Good Law existed, do exist and will exist—this is the nature of the Buddhas."[2]

This statement indicates clearly that through the absolute truth, some realized their Buddha-hood in the past, some realize it in the present, while others will realize it in future, thus showing that they were originally possessed of the germ of Buddha-hood. From the standpoint of the absolute truth, every one can be Buddha.

Next, let us see what is the conception of the Mahāsanghika school on the 'human life.' In the Nikāya-bheda-dharmamati-chakra-sāstra (or I-pu-tsum-lun-lun) by Vasumitra.[3] It is stated :—

"The nature of mind (of being) originally was pure (vimala), but it has been encumbered by suffering which did not exist originally, therefore, the mind became impure."[4]

This statement shows clearly that the original Mahāsanghikas, the Ekavyavahārika, the Lokottaravāda

[1] S N 56 24 (Part V, p 403) The same expression we find in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra, p 396, Bibliotheca Indica Edition

[2] Translated by my colleague Mr Sailendranath Mitra, M.A

[3] He is Vasumitra II and contemporary of King Kanishka II (about 140 A.D.)

[4] Toyo Daigaku Edition. Tokyo, p 91

and the Kaukkautika schools held that all individual beings originally were possessed of 'pure mind.' The 'pure mind' here signifies what is called 'Buddha-sabhāva' of the Mahāyāna Buddhism : that is to say all human lives originally possessed the 'nature of Buddha.' This idea is clearly expressed in the Mahāyāna-avataṁsaka-sūtra where it is said —

"The mind (universal mind), Buddha and human life are one and the same."[1]

Therefore, this Mahāsanghika conception, more or less, indicates Buddha's Ontological perception on the 'human life' and speaking generally, the conception of Mahāsaṅghika can be identified with that of Buddha's perception regarding the problem at hand.

Lastly, let us see what is the conception of Mahāyāna sūtra on the same point. Regarding this, the Mahāyāna sūtras, the Avatamsaka and Saddharmapundarīka-sūtras, are specially important.

The very statement "the mind (universal mind) Buddha and the human life are one and the same," is the very expression of Avatamsaka-sūtra on the idea. Again, throughout the same Sūtras, we find such conception that all human lives unite with 'Dharma-kāya,' that is to say, human lives exist within the 'Dharma-kāya-Buddha' Therefore, it is not wrong to hold that in these Sūtras Buddha's Ontological perception on human lives has been manifested more clearly than the doctrines of Mahāsanghika schools But concrete form of this conception can be found only in Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra. It has been said there :—

"कतमच्च शारिपुत्र तथागतस्यैककृत्यमेककरणीयं महाकृत्यं महाकरणीयं येन कृत्येन तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यकसंबुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। यदिदं तथागतज्ञानदर्शनसमादापनहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानां तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यकसंबुद्धो

[1] Tien Bundle Vol 7, p 57 B, of Chinese Tripitaka.

लोक उत्पद्यते। तथागतज्ञानदर्शनसंदर्शनहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानां तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यक्संबुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। तथागतज्ञानदर्शनावतारणहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानां तथागतोऽर्हन्सम्यक्संबुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। तथागतज्ञानप्रतिबोधनहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानां तथागतोऽर्हन्सम्यक्संबुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। तथागतज्ञानदर्शनमार्गावतारणहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानां तथागतोऽर्हन्सम्यक्संबुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते।"[1]

"This, O Sāriputra, is the sole object, the sole aim, the sole purpose of his appearance in the world. Such then, Sāriputra, is the sole object, the sole aim, the lofty object, the lofty aim of the Tathāgata And it is achieved by the Tathāgata For, Sāriputra, I do show all creatures the sight of Tathāgata-knowledge ; I do open the eyes of creatures for the sight of Tathāgata-knowledge, Sāriputra ; I do firmly establish the teaching of Tathāgata-knowledge, Sāriputra , I do lead the teaching of Tathāgata-knowledge on the right part."[2]

In the above statement, the conception of Mahāyāna Buddhism on the 'human life' reached its highest zenith and here again Buddha's Ontological perception on the same point has been fully revealed If all human lives had not possessed 'the nature of Buddha' as well as 'Buddha-hood' originally, then how could the Buddha, as stated in the Sūtra, show, open, establish, and lead to the 'Buddha-knowledge' Through the expression of this statement we therefore, come to know definitely that all human lives originally possessed 'Buddha's nature' as well as the germ of 'Buddha-hood' Thus, Buddha's conception, the conception of Mahāsanghika school and the conception of Mahāyāna sūtras on the 'human life' has been shown to be nearly related.

To sum up · in above three sections (II, III and IV), we have, after lengthy discussion, shown clearly a close

[1] Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra, Part I, p 40

[2] S B E, XXI, p 40

relation among the Buddha's Ontological perception and the doctrines of Mahāsanghika school as well as that of Mahāyāna sūtras on the three points (*i.e.*, on cosmic existence, Buddhalogy, and human life). And at the same time we have found out their doctrinal identification also. That is to say, Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological preception on the said three points, showing a close relation with the conception of Mahāsanghika school and the doctrine of Mahāyāna sūtras on the same points

We can now arrive at a conclusion by holding that Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception transformed into the form of Mahāyāna sūtras and it manifested in the Mahāyāna doctrines by the men of Mahāsanghika school and their lineage And at the same time we understand this also that such Mahāyāna sūtras as existed before the time of Nāgārjuna were compiled by Mahāsanghikas. Hence it will not be going far away from historical truth to hold that, man of Mahāsanghika schools were '*forefather of the Mahāyānist.*'

At the end of this section, I would like to remind you one important feature in the Mahāyāna sūtras. Among the many Mahāyāna sūtras, Prajñāpāramitā, Avataṁsaka and Saddharmapundarīka and the like are the most important as well as representative in character. Among them Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras mainly reveal Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception on the cosmic existence, while Avtamsaka-sūtras mainly dwell upon Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception upon Buddha's own personality as well as human life. And lastly, both the conception of cosmic existences and Buddha's own personality as well as human lives has been again manifested fully and in concrete form, in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra. This is the reason, I think, why this Sūtra has been regarded as the heart of whole

Mahāyāna Sūtras by the founders of various sects of the Buddhism in China and Japan from the ancient time.

In Charts.

Buddha's perception

(On the cosmic existence)

Manifested in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras

(On his own personality and human life)

Manifested in the Avataṁsaka-sūtras

Both fully dealt with in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra

CHAPTER III.

Why did the men of the Mahāsanghika schools coin and use the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna?

Let us now turn our attention to the main discussion. The terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' as I have told you, in the previous section, could not be of Hīnayāna origin, but were undoubtedly coined and used by the Mahāyānists. In the previous section, I have also discussed that the men of Mahāsanghika schools, were forefathers of the Mahāyānists, and Mahāyāna doctrines were made manifested and their Sūtras were formed by them. This being so, we may hold that the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' were for the first time coined and used by the Mahāsanghikas. Hence the question necessarily arises, for what reason the men of Mahāsaṅghika school coined and used those terms? The reason is not far to seek. I may at once point out, that the conflict between the Sthaviravādins and the Mahāsanghikas as regarding the superiority of their doctrines led to the coinage of these terms.

According to the Southern as well as Northern records of Buddhism, it was the historical event, that even in the Buddha's lifetime, disciples of the Buddha held different opinions on Buddha's doctrine and in consequence a great conflict arose among themselves.[1] But at that time the conflict was limited to individuals only. It was for the first time, in the history of Indian Buddhism, that different opinions of different parties and different schools were afloat at the Vaiśālī Council, known in the

[1] About this point, I have fully discussed in my 'History of early Buddhist Schools' in the Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, Vol III, Part II.

Buddhist history of India as the Second Council. And why these different parties and different schools came to the arena of Buddhism, will be all clear to us, if we understand the characteristics of both the schools. That is to say, the Mahāsaṅghika party was liberal and advanced, while the Sthavira party was conservative, who loyally stuck to the Original Buddhism preached by Buddha in general. Hence, their doctrines on the 'cosmic existence' and 'Buddhalogy,' etc., must naturally be different. Consequently, they had always a conflict of opinion. The Mahāsaṅghikas did not rest satisfied with the Phenomenological aspect of Buddha's doctrine preached in general, but wanted to rightly manifest Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception upon the 'cosmic existence,' 'Buddhalogy,' as well as 'human life.' Such being the case, the conflict of the parties went on and at last, just one hundred years after Buddha's Parinirvāṇa, actual separation was made at the Council of Vaiśālī on the questions (*i*) 'The ten different points' of Vinaya and (*ii*) 'Bhadra's five points' of doctrine.[1]

Owing to their conflict in Vaiśālī, the Sthaviras excommunicated the Mahāsaṅghikas, on the ground of their introducing heretical views into the Buddha's

[1] According to the statements of the Southern school of Buddhism, 'the ten points' of the Vinaya were only the cause of that separation between the Sthaviras and Mahāsaṅghikas But Northern records maintain that 'the five points of Bhadra' were only the cause of that separation (Chinese records on the other hand state 'Mahādeva's five points' instead of 'Bhadra's five points' but to me this is an error) I hold both to be real causes, because, their opinions must be differentiated on the 'Vinaya' as well as on the 'doctrine' However, different schools state the cause according to their point of view As to the reason of this, I would like to say that Sthaviras of Southern school belong to the lineage of the Vinaya Bhāṇaka, while the Northern school of the Sthaviras belong to that of Sūtra-Bhāṇaka. Therefore, to the former, the Vinaya is essential, so far as the teachings of Buddda are concerned so they mantained the 'ten points' of Vinaya as the only cause. While to the latter, the Sūtra is essential, so they maintained the 'five points' of Bhadra as its only cause. About this point I have discussed fully in my 'History of Early Buddhist Schools.'

doctrine. Not only that much, but Sthaviras even called them by the bad epithet 'Adharma-vādin' (holder of the heretical doctrine) and 'Pāpa-bhikṣu' (sinful monk).[1] After the time of Vaiśālī, Mahāsanghika school was getting into power and popularity among the Buddhist communities. But it pained them much to have had such epithets like 'Adharma-vādin' and 'Pāpa-bhikṣu' Henceforward, they harboured much rage upon Sthaviras, and began to search for such a term as could display the superiority of their own doctrine, on the one hand, and disparage the doctrine of their opponent, on the other Many terms were invented by them, but none suited their purpose. After great exertion, they at last coined the terms 'Hīnayāna' and 'Mahāyāna,' the former, they thought to be the fit epithet for their opponents Sthaviras, as serving their purpose, while the latter, conveying a sense of superiority, they reserved for themselves.

Thus, the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' came into being.

[1] Dīpavaṁśa p 36 Just the same expression we find in the Mahāvibāṣā-śāstra of Sarvāstivādins (see Shou Bundle, Vol 4, pp 96-98, of Chinese Tripiṭaka) Regarding this point we have a very interesting statement in the Mahāyāna Vinaya We find there, many times, that "If any one call Mahāyānist by the term 'Adharma-vādin,' then it will be the greatest sin" From this, it is evident that Mahāyānists were sometimes called by the term 'Adharma-vādin' by the Hīnayānists

CHAPTER IV.

How the Mahāsanghikas found out or coined the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna?

The terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' are not met with in the Pāli Nikāyas nor in the Chinese translation of Buddhist Âgamas which are regarded as the most trustworthy of all extant records of the original form of Buddhism. But these terms, on the contrary, have been used several times in Mahāyāna Sūtras as well as Śastras, as I have already noted in the introduction. And I have also discussed in the previous section that these terms were coined and used by the men of Mahāsaṅghika school. Here one thing, we should bear in mind, that every word has more or less, its history at its back. Therefore, such terms like 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' did not come into use all on a sudden; they must have passed through a series of previous historical stages. As I have already said, the Mahāsanghikas, before they could finally coin these terms, had to come across a good deal of similar other terms. So, our first duty is to find out the terms they used before the coinage of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna.' Then we should see how they found out and which one was first used and which was next.

If we look at Mahāyāna Sūtras like Prajñāpāramitā, Avataṁsaka and Saddharmapundarīka-sūtras which are regarded as the earliest existing ones among Mahāyāna Sūtras before the time of Nāgārjuna, we find several terms like 'Ekayāna,'[1] 'Agrayāna,'[2] 'Anuttarayāna,'[3]

[1] See under the explanation of the term 'Ekayāna'

[2] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka sūtra, Part I, p 61, Bibliotheca Buddhica Edition, and Ti'en Bundle, Vol 5, p 26*a*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

Ti'en Bundle, Vol 9, p. 12*a*, Vol 10, p 1*a*, Vol 10, p 48*a*, of Chinese Tripitaka and Karnapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, p 67, (B T S Edition, Calcutta)

'Uttamayāna,'[1] 'Paramayāna' (Prathamayāna or Sreṣṭhayāna),[2] 'Bodhisattvayāna,'[3] and 'Buddhayāna,' as synonymous with the term 'Mahāyāna.' Among the terms 'Ekayāna,' 'Buddhayāna'[4] and 'Bodhisattvayāna' have been used more frequently than the other terms, and when the term 'Ekayāna' was used in the place where Buddha's Ontological ideas have been expressed or in the place of the term 'Mahāyāna,' then the corresponding terms 'Dviyāna' or 'Triyāna' were used in the place where Buddha's Phenomenological ideas have been expressed or in the place of the term Hīnayāna. For example, in the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra it is stated thus:—

"एकं हि यानं द्वितियं न विद्यते तृतियं हि नैवास्ति कदाचि लोके।"[5]

"There is, indeed, but one vehicle; there is no second, nor a third, anywhere in the world."[6]

The same statement occurs many times in the same Sūtra.[7] And the terms 'Anuttarayāna,' 'Prathamayāna,' 'Agrayāna,' 'Paramayāna' and 'Uttamayāna' are nothing but the synonyms of the term 'Ekayāna.' Similarly, when the terms 'Buddhayāna' or 'Bodhisattvayāna' were used in the place where Buddha's Ontological ideas have been expressed or in the place of the term Mahāyāna, then the terms 'Arhatyāna,' 'Śrāvakayāna' were used in the place where Buddha's Phenomenological ideas have been expressed or in the place of the term 'Hīnayāna.' We see also that the term 'Ekayāna,'

[1] Lalita Vistara, p 142 (J R A S, p 34, 1900)
[2] J R A S, p 33, 1900
[3] See under the explanation of the term 'Bodhisattvayāna'
[4] See under the explanation of the term 'Buddhayāna.'
[5] Part I, p 46, of Bibliotheca Edition
[6] S B E, Vol. XXI, p 46
[7] Part I, pp 48-49, pp 76, 79, 8a, Part II, pp 13a, 189

though sometimes indicates the same idea as expressed by the term 'Buddhayāna,' it mainly occurs where Buddha's Ontological ideas on 'cosmic existence' are dealt with. On the contrary where Buddha's Ontological ideas on the 'human life' are mainly dealt with, the terms 'Buddhayāna' and Bodhisattvayāna are used. But the term 'Mahāyāna' was indicative of Buddha's Ontological perception on both 'cosmic existence' and 'human life'; that is say, this term indicates the sense both of 'Ekayāna' and 'Buddhayāna' or 'Bodhisattvayāna.' Here we should bear in mind that the term 'Mahāyāna' as well as 'Hināyāna' which occur in early Mahāyāna Sūtras like Prajñāpāramitā and Saddharmapuṇḍarīka were not yet used in the sense of comparison as we find them in the later Mahāyāna Sūtras and Śāstras which came to being about the time of Nāgārjuna. For example, in the Sāddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, we find the term 'Hīnayāna' only twice[1] and in the Chinese translation of Pañca-vimsati-sāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra we find the term once only[2] but there the term was not used to serve the purpose of comparison. But in the Chinese translation of Suvikrāntavikrami-paripricchā of Mahāprajñāpāramitā[3] and Mahāyāna-parinirvāṇa-sūtras[4] which are regarded as later composition, we find several times the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' used in the sense of comparison. Now it is clear that the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' came into existence later than the terms 'Ekayāna' and 'Buddhayāna' or Bodhisattvayāna, etc.

In my opinion, these terms were in vogue in the time of Nāgārjuna.

[1] Part 1, p 60, and Part 2, p 147

[2] Yuch Bundle, Vol 5, p 43a, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[3] Yūch Bundle, Vol 8, pp 67b, and 68a

[4] These sūtras are included in the In Bundle, Vols 5-9, where these terms have been used many times

Our next enquiry then, is to find out the priority of these different terms that came into use before the coinage of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna.' The terms 'Ekayāna,' 'Anuttarayāna,' 'Vinayayāna,' 'Brahmayāna' and 'Dhammayāna,' occur both in the Pāli Nikāyas and the Chinese translations of the four Âgamas. For example in the Samyutta Nikāya it has been stated :—

" *Ekayāno'yam* maggo sattānam visuddhiyā." [1]

" This is the only path, the only course, that exists for the purification of the beings.

Again, in the same Sutta .—

" Imass' eva kho etam Ānanda ariyass' aṭṭhangikassa maggassa adhivacanam *Brahmayānamiti* pi *dhammayānamiti* pi anuttara-sangāmavijaya iti pi." [2]

" O Ānanda, the synonym of this Noble Eightfold Path is Brahmayāna, Dhammayāna and Transcendental Victory."

Again, in the same Sutta :—

" Etad attaniyam bhūtam, *Brahmayānaṃ* anuttaraṃ, Niyyanti dhīrā lokamahā, aññadatthu jayaṁ jayanti." [3]

" This is reflected in self, this is transcendental Brahmayāna ; [4] the wise are led out of the world (by means of this yāna) ; victory is sure and certain.

[1] S N, Part V, pp 167-168, p 185, and A N, Vol III, p. 314

[2] S. N, Part V, p 5

[3] S N, Part V, p 6

[4] Yassa sadd ā ca paññāha||dhammā yuttā sadā dhuram ||hir Isā mano yottaṃ|| sati ārakkasārathi||

Ratho sīlaparikkhāro||Jhānakkho cakkaviriyo||upekkhā dhura-samādhi|| anicchā parivāranam||

Abyāpādo avihiṃsā||viveko yassa āvudhaṃ||titikkhā dhammasannāho|| yogakkhemāya vattati|| (S. N part V p 6).

In the Chinese translation of Saṁyuktāgama-sūtra, we find the following passage corresponding exactly to the First Pāli passage quoted above thus.—

"Here is the one Path, the only course that (*Ekayāna mārga*) exists for the purification of all human beings."[1] Again, in the same Āgama we meet with another passage which corresponds to the aforesaid Third Pāli quotation, thus:—

"O Ānanda! Saddharma *Vinayayāna*, *Devayāna*, *Brahmayāna* can conquer of the army of the suffering. Listen to me and think of my words, what I am going to say to you, O Ānanda! what is that thing which has been called by the terms *Saddharma Vinayayāna*, *Devayāna* and *Brahmayāna* those which can conquer the army of the suffering? That is nothing but the 'Eightfold noble margas."[2]

Thus, we find the terms 'Ekayāna' and 'Anuttarayāna,' etc., from the Pāli Nikāyas as well as from the Chinese translation of the four Agamas. And we should also remember that the terms 'Ekayāna' and 'Anuttarayāna' are met with in the Mahāyāna sūtras. So these terms are common to both the Original form of Buddhism and the Developed form of Buddhism. The connotation of the terms, however, is different in different forms of Buddhism. That is to say, in the Original form of Buddhism, it indicates only the 'Atthaṅgika-magga' (the Eightfold noble path) or the 'Majjhima—patipadā' (the middle path). While in the Mahāyāna Sūtras it indicates Buddha's Ontological perception both on 'cosmic existence' and on 'human life' For example, in the

[1] Shen Bundle, Vol 3, p. 11a, p 14a, p. 15b of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

[2] Shen Bundle, Vol. 3, p 64a of Chinese Tripiṭaka

Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra it is stated thus :—

"एवं च भाषाम्यहु नित्यनिर्वृता आदि प्रशान्ता इमि सर्वधर्माः ।
चर्यां च यो पूरयि बुद्धपुत्रो अनागते ऽध्वानि जिनो भविष्यति ॥"
उपायकौशल्य ममेवरूपं यत्त्रीणि यानान्युपदर्शयमि ।
एकं तु यानं हि नयश्च एक एका चिय देशन नयकानाम् ॥" [1]

And so do I reveal all those laws that are ever holy and correct from the very first. And the son of Buddha who has completed his course shall once be a Jina.

It is but my skilfulness which prompts me to manifest three vehicles; for there is but one vehicle and one track; there is also but one instruction by the leaders.[2]

Again, in the same Sūtra :—

"स्थितिका हि एषा सद धर्मनेत्री प्रकृतिश्च धर्माण सदा प्रभास्वरा ।
विदित्व बुद्धा द्विपदानमुत्तमा प्रकाशयिष्यन्ति ममेकयानम् ॥" [3]

"The line of the law forms an unbroken continuity and the nature of its properties is always manifest. Knowing this, the Buddhas, the highest of men, shall reveal this single vehicle." [4]

The above quotation shows that the term 'Ekayāna' indicates Buddha's perception on cosmic existence.

Again, in the same Sūtra :—

"एकमेवाहं शारिपुत्र यानमारभ्य सत्वानां धर्मं देशयामि यदिदं
बुद्धयानं । न किंचिच्छारिपुत्र द्वितीयं वा तृतीयं वा यानं संविद्यते ।" [5]

"Sāriputra, by means of one sole Vehicle, to wit, the Buddha-vehicle, Sāriputra, do I teach creatures the law; there is no second Vehicle nor a third." [6]

Above quotation shows the term 'Ekayāna' points to Buddha's perception on 'Human life.'

[1] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka sūtra, Part I p 48
[2] S B E, Vol XXI, p 48
[3] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Part I, p 53
[4] S. B E, Vol XXI, p 53
[5] Saddharmapundarīka sūtra, Part I, pp 40, 42, 44.
[6] S B E, Vol XXI, pp 40, 41, 43

The same expression we find in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras.[1]

This being the case, it became quite evident that the term 'Ekayāna' or 'Anuttarayāna,' etc., were used by Buddha's immediate disciples. Not only that, but it may not be wrong to observe that such terms were used even in the lifetime of Buddha himself.

(1) The term Ekayāna.

Our problem here is to discuss how Mahāsanghikas appropriated the term 'Ekayāna' for their own use. From what has been discussed above, we can easily imagine and come to the conclusion that as soon as the Mahāsanghikas were excommunicated by Sthaviras with such disparaging epithets as 'Adharma-vādin' and 'Pāpa-bhikṣu,' they began to seek for such a term whereby they could display the superiority of their own doctrine and disparage that of their opponents. But they could not find any other suitable term than the term 'Ekayāna.' They found it in the Original teachings of Buddha which were common to all of his disciples and followers at that time. They applied it to their own doctrine, that is to say, they used it particularly for the indication of Buddha's Ontological perception on both 'cosmic existence' and 'human life.' And they thought it to be the most suitable term to distinguish themselves from their opponents so far as doctrinal superiority is concerned. On the other hand they called the Sthaviras by the name of 'Dviyāna'

[1] "एकयानसमारूढा वर्तेमि मम बोधिसत्त्वा महासत्त्वा एकमार्गसमारूढा . . . महासत्त्वाः ।"
(Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra p. 422, of Bibliotheca Indica Edition
Again in the same Sūtra —
"येचखलु पुनरिमे आयुष्मन् सुभुत वयो बोधिसत्त्वयानिका पुद्गलास्तथागतेनाख्याता एष नथाणा व्यवस्थानं न भवति। एकमेव हि यानम्भवति यदुत बुद्धयान बोधिसत्त्वयानं यथाआयुष्मत सुभुते निर्दिष्टः ॥" (The same Sūtra, p. 139)

with a view to indicate their inferiority. But it appears to me that some time afterwards the Mahāsanghikas get themselves puzzled over the term 'Ekayāna' as being common to both parties, indicating on one hand Buddha's Ontological perception from their point of view, while expressing the idea of 'Eight-fold noble path' of the Original Buddhism as well as of the Sthaviras on the other hand. Therefore, they came to realise that the term was not so suitable as they first thought it to be. Hence, the Mahāsanghikas once more began to search for another appropriate one. This time they invented the term 'Buddhayāna' or 'Bodhisattvayāna.'

(2) *The terms Buddhayāna and Bodhisattvayāna.*

In the Pāli Nikāya and the Chinese translation of the Four Āgamas, we find the terms 'Ekayāna,' etc., but no mention has been made therein of the term of 'Buddhayāna' and 'Bodhisattvayāna'; while throughout the Mahayāna Sūtras particularly in the earlier ones, these terms are several times met with. So we can at once hold that as soon as the Mahāsanghikas found that the term 'Ekayāna' did not suit their purpose, they, after searching for a more appropriate one coined the terms 'Buddhayāna' and 'Bodhisattvayāna.' It would in this connection not be improper to say that the term 'Ekayāna' was discovered at first and such terms as 'Buddhayāna' and 'Bodhisattvayāna' were invented next, while the 'Mahāyāna' was the last term that they could adopt and apply for themselves. The terms 'Buddhayāna' and Bodhisattvayāna' which they preferred to 'Ekayāna' were invented and applied by them to indicate the superiority of their doctrines, or in other words, they applied these terms to indicate Buddha's Ontological perceptions, calling at the same time the

doctrines of the Sthaviras by the terms 'Arhatyāna' 'Śrāvakayāna' indicative of their inferiority. For example, the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra states thus :—

"त्रैधातुके श्रेष्ठविशिष्टयानं यद्बुद्धयानं सुगतेहि वर्णितम् ।"[1]

"The best and the most excellent vehicle in the whole of the threefold world is the Buddha-vehicle magnified by the Sugatas."[2]

Again, in the same Sūtra :—

"एकमेवाहं शारिपुत्र यानमारभ्य सत्वानां धर्मं देशयामि यदिदं बुद्धयानं ।"[3]

"I do lead the teaching of Tathāgata-knowledge or the right path, Sāriputra. By means of one sole vehicle to wit, the Buddha-vehicle, Sāriputra, do I teach creatures the law."[4]

The same statements are found about six times in the same chapter in the same Sūtra.[5] We also come across the same expressions mentioned several times in the Prajñāpāramitā and Avataṁsaka-sūtras. Here we should bear in mind that of the terms 'Buddhayāna' and 'Bodhisattvayāna,' the former has been used more frequently than the latter. The latter again has been used as being synonymous of the former in the Mahāyāna Sūtras. For example, in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā sūtra :—

"एकमेवहि यानमभवरि यदुत बुद्धयानं बोधिसत्त्वयानं यथा आयुष्मत: सुभूतेर्निर्दिष्ट: ॥"[6]

"There is only one vehicle *viz.*, Buddhayāna, or Bodhisattvayāna, as has been pointed out by venerable Subhūti."

[1] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Part I, p 11
[2] S B. E, Vol XXI, p. 11.
[3] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Part I, p 40
[4] S B E, Vol XXI, p. 40
[5] P. k., Part 1, pp 41, 49, 43, 44, etc.
[6] P. 319, Bibliotheca Indica Edition

Again, the identical expressions occur several times in the Chinese translation of Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras and in Avataṁsaka-sūtra, etc.[1] Let us discuss a little further as to the relation of these two terms. The term 'Bodhisattvayāna' indicates a vehicle by which all human beings can attain Bodhisattva-hood, while the term 'Buddhayāna' indicates a vehicle by which all human beings can attain Buddha-hood. We should also know that the Bodhisattva-hood is the previous stage of a Buddha or one who is on the way of attaining perfect knowledge; while the Buddha-hood the highest stage of the former or one who has already attained the Perfect Knowledge. Therefore, properly speaking Bodhisattva and Buddha do not much differ from each other, the only difference being as regards the stage of Perfection. So the terms 'Buddhayāna' and 'Bodhisattvayāna,' though they go by different namings, yet express the same idea as it were. Regarding this we find a nice example in the Chinese translation of the Pañcaviṅśati-sāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra. Where 'Bodhisattvayāna' has been termed 'Bodhisattva-Buddhayāna.'[2] We also find a nice explanation of Nāgārjuna in his Prajñāpāramitā-sāstra:—

"The question is, whether this vehicle (yāna) is the dharma of Buddha or the dharma of Bodhisattva" The answer is:—This is the dharma of Bodhisattva .. and this vehicle possessed the great power and can at once obtain Buddha-hood."[3] Here our question is how then the Mahāsanghikas could invent these terms and why did they rest satisfied with them? In answer, I should like to say that the Mahāsaṅghikas thought that such terms

[1] Yuch Bundle, Vol 9, p 10b, Vol 3, p 24b, 42a, 51a, Vol 4, p 14a, p 48a and T'ien Bundle Vol 6, p 45a, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[2] Yüeh Bundle, Vol 2, p 10b

[3] Wang Bundle, Vol. 3, p 52a

can only be used to indicate an important aspect of Buddha's Introspectional perception. In other words, these terms they thought, were clearly indicative of Buddha's Ontological perception on 'human life,' *i.e.*, the realization of the highest life having no beginning and no end which Siddhārtha discovered himself as soon as he attained to the Buddha-hood. Again, through his experience and perception he understood that all human beings originally possess the 'nature of Buddha' (Buddha-svabhāva) or 'the mind of Buddha' (Buddha-citta). Nay, he understood not only this much but also that all human beings were originally possessed of Bodhisattva-hood and Buddha-hood having no beginning and no end. Therefore, he tried to make men realise the highest life which he himself attained. Why Buddha made such exertion is clearly expressed in the following statement of Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra :

"कतमच्च शारिपुत्र तथागतस्यैककृत्यमेककरणीयं महाकृत्यं महाकरणीयं येन कृत्येन तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यकसंवुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। यदिदं तथागतज्ञानदर्शनसमादापनहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानं तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यकसंवद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। तथागतज्ञानदर्शनसंदर्शनहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानं तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यकसंबुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। तथागतज्ञानदर्शनावतारणहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानां तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यकसंबुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। तथागतज्ञानप्रतिबोधनहेतु निमित्तं सत्त्वानां तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यकसंबुद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते। तथागतज्ञानदर्शनमार्गावतारणहेतुनिमित्तं सत्त्वानां तथागतो ऽर्हन्सम्यमसंबद्धो लोक उत्पद्यते।"[1]

"For, Sāriputra, it is for a sole object, a sole aim, verily a lofty object, a lofty aim that the Buddha, the Tathāgata, etc., appears in the world. And what is that sole object, that sole aim, that lofty object, that lofty aim of the Buddha, the Tathāgata, etc., appearing in the world? To show all creatures the sight of Tathāgata-knowledge

[1] Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra, Part I, p 40

does the Buddha, the Tathāgata, etc., appear in the world; to open the eyes of creatures for the sight of Tathāgata-knowledge does the Buddha, the Tathāgata, etc., appear in the world. This, O Sāriputra, is the sole object, the sole aim, the sole purpose of his appearance in the world. Such then, Sāriputra, is the sole object, the sole aim, the lofty object, the lofty aim of the Tathāgata. And it is achieved by the Tathāgata. For, Sāriputra, I do show all creatures the sight of Tathāgata-knowledge; I do open the eyes of creatures for the sight of Tathāgata-knowledge, Sāriputra; I do firmly establish the teaching of Tathāgata-knowledge, Sāriputra; I do lead the teaching of Tathāgata-knowledge on the right path, Sāriputra."[1]

The men of the Mahāsanghika school having realized this profound Ontological perception of Buddha on 'human life' established at first the idea of 'Vimala-citta' which is one of the important features of their doctrine. Furthermore, through the idea of 'Vimala-chitta' along with the primitive Bodhisattva conception they established the idea of Buddhalogy which afterwards became the Tri-kāya doctrine in the Mahāyāna Buddhism And thereby they invented the terms 'Buddhayāna' and 'Bodhisttvayāna' which to them, were quite suitable and independent ones.

Here a historical investigation as to the invention of the terms by the Mahāsaṅghika is necessary.

A historical study of the terms Buddhayāna and Bodhisattvayāna.

The idea of Bodhisattva was not entirely absent in the primitive Buddhism. But, in the primitive Buddhism, the Bodhisattva conception dealt mainly with

[1] S B E, Vol. XXI, p 40

the former life of Sakyamuni Buddha and sometimes with that of a particular Buddha of the past or the future.

The Cariya-piṭaka [1] which is acknowledged as the fifteenth book of the Khuddhaka-nikāya, contains thirty-four short Jātaka stories in verse, in which a brief account of Buddha's meritorious [2] action during his Bodhisattva cariya has been given, while the Canonical books of the Jātakas consisting only of verses generally give an elaborate account of his meritorious deeds during his Bodhisattva cariya.[3] This much is certain that Cariya-pitaka is a simplified or reduced form of the canonical Jātaka stories. Hence it can possibly be said that the idea of Bodhisattva in primitive sense must have existed at a time when those Jātakas came into being. Of course, the Cariya-piṭaka might have existed at a comparatively later time as has already been pointed out by Dr. Rhys Davids. But in my opinion it must be a Post-Aśokan production. That the said canonical Jātaka book in verses which according to Dr. Rhys Davids was at least older than the Council of Vaiśālī, is admissible.

From the discovery of Dr. Rhys Davids, we came to learn that Suttanta Jātakas [4] as he calls them, are

[1] There is one Sūtra in the translation of the Chinese Tripiṭaka entitled Ṣatpāramitā-sannipāta-sūtra translated by Khāń-Sań-hwui of the Wu dynasty 222 A.D. in 8 fasciculi (see Nanjio's catalogue, p 47, No. 143). This Sūtra is exactly of the same type as the Cariya-piṭaka Prof. G Ono who possessed vast knowledge of Buddhist arts, said in his 'Buddhist Art' (in Japanese) that many of the Jātaka stories illustrated by bas-reliefs on the Bhārhut Stūpa are identical with the Jātaka stories stated in this Sūtra. And he has already identified some of them.

[2] Dr Rhys Davids's Buddhist India, p 176, and Buddhist Birth Stories, p. [illegible]

[3] The Jātaka book containing 570 stories is a quite later production. And it has been said that it was written probably in the 5th century A D in Ceylon by an unknown author. And this is a commentary on the said canonical Jātaka books. Therefore [illegible] should be 'the commentary on the Jātakas' (see Buddhist India of Dr Rhys Davids p. 207)

[4] [illegible] used on the Suttanta of Dīgha Majjhima and as well as [illegible] called Suttanta Jatakas (see Buddhist India, p. 195)

older specimens of the canonical Jātakas. He has also pointed out one of the most important matters as to the historical study of Jātaka cult in his Buddhist India. Regarding this he has said that stories are told in the older documents, and the hero is expressly identified with the Buddha in a previous birth, for instance; Ghatikāra (M. 2.53); Mahā-govinda (D. 2.220); Paccetana's wheelwright (A I, III); and Mahā-vijaya's (D.1. 143), were called Jātakas, even before the Jātaka books grew up, though they were not included in the Jātaka collection.[1]

Again,

"There is a very ancient division found already in the Nikāyas,[2] of Buddhist literature into nine classes. One of these is 'Jātakaṃ' that is to say, Jātakas. And this must refer to such episodes in previously existing books. It cannot refer to Jātaka book now included in the canon, for that was not yet in existence"

The two types of Jātakas pointed out by Dr Rhys Davids which represent the earlier stages in the development of Jātaka stories, do not contain the Bodhisattva idea embodied in the canonical Jātaka books which are, therefore, of later growth.

Dīpavaṁśa,[3] in connection with the separation of the Mahāsanghikas from the Sthaviras at Vaiśālī, incidentally refers to 'Jātaka' as one of the existing Buddhist scriptures. The Jātaka here, according to me, refers to nothing but the canonical Jātaka collection containing only the verses. Dīpavamśa which cannot be placed prior to the fourth century A.D., seems to bear but a poor evidence of the events of seven centuries before.

[1] Buddhist India, p 196

[2] Majjhima 133, Anguttara 2 7, 103, 108, pp 43, 178, Vinaya, 3 8 (see also Buddhist Birth Stories, p lxii)

[3] V, 35

But, after all it is the best we have, as it is acknowledged to have been based on earlier sources; and according to Ceylonese tradition, it is at least a reliable evidence that a book called the Jātaka existed at the time of Vaiśālī Council,[1] 386 B.C. There is yet further evidence confirming the Dīpavaṃśa tradition; the Buddhist scriptures are sometimes spoken of as consisting of nine different divisions or sorts of texts (angānī) of which the seventh is the Jātaka (or the Jātaka collection). This division of the sacred book is mentioned not only in the Dīpavamsa, but in Sumangala-vilāsini and Anguttara-nikāya (one of the later work included in the Pāli pitaka),[2] as well as in the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra.[3]

Regarding this point, we have the most important and highly interesting evidence in the Archæological researches. In the carvings on the railings round the relic shrine of Śānchi, Amarāvati and particularly of Bhārhut, many of the Buddhist Jātakas have been illustrated. And almost all of the illustrated Jātakas are indicative of Bodhisattva cariya. Thus from the above statements, it becomes clear that the canonical Jātaka stories, as we call them, existed already in the third century B.C. And the Jātaka cult was prevalent among the common people at the time.

Again, as these Jātakas represent the Bodhisattva idea of the former life of the Sākyamuni Buddha, the presumption, therefore, is that the primitive Bodhisattva idea already existed at the time of Vaiśālī Council, held one hundred years after Buddha's Mahāparinirvāṇa. On this point, *i.e.*, the then existing Bodhisattva idea, I venture to go a little farther from internal point of view.

[1] Buddhist Birth Stories, p. lviii.

[2] Buddhist Birth Stories, by Dr. Rhys Davids, p. lxii.

[3] Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Part I, p. 45.

As I have discussed many times in previous chapters, one of the most important causes of separation of the Mahāsaṅghikas from the Sthaviras at the Council of Vaiśālī was the doctrinal differentiation and the conception regarding the Buddha's great personality (or Buddhalogy) became one important aspect of their doctrines at that time. Such doctrines must, therefore, have come into being, after Buddha's Parinirvāṇa. The primitive Bodhisattva-idea was the starting point of their Buddhalogy. The said separation of the parties in the Vaiśālī Council was a real fact. As it is a fundamental truth that the cause must precede the fact, it must be admitted that their separation, was due to some causes which in one way or the other, point to difference of of opinions between the two parties regarding the Buddhalogy. And such conception of the Buddhalogy originated with the deep emotional feeling of the most faithful and devoted followers of Buddha, out of their reverence towards the personality of their great master after his Mahāparinirvāṇa. The primitive idea of Bodhisattva is, as I have said, the first lead of their emotional feeling for the master. No one doubts that almost all of Buddha's disciples and followers had deep regard for or faith upon him. Therefore, the primitive Bodhisattva idea was common to all of them. But different opinions gradually grew up among them to give rise to different Buddhalogies, in consequence whereof they were divided into different parties. Therefore, the primitive idea of Bodhisattva came into being long before the Vaiśālī Council.

In my opinion, during the period covering the Second and the Third Council (*i.e.*, 386-232 B.C.), the original Mahāsanghika school, through the primitive Bodhisattva idea, as well as their realisation of Buddha's Introspectional perception on human life, began to

hold such an advanced Buddhalogy as we get in the statement of Vasumitra's treatise. They, thereby, held, "Every human being is Bodhisattva" and "Every human being possessed Buddhahood." In this way, they gradually transformed themselves into Mahāyānists and their doctrine into Mahāyāna Buddhism. Side by side with such movement, as aforesaid, they coined the terms 'Bodhisattvayāna' and 'Buddhayāna.' The following discussion will make the point more clear.

If we look at the Cariya-pitaka, as well as the Jātaka proper we will find the 'Ten perfections' (daśapāramitā or (daśapāramitā-bhūmi) which Gotama Buddha had to acquire during his previous births as Bodhisattva.

They are :—

(1) Generosity (dāna): (2) Good conduct (sīla); (3) Renunciation (nekkhamma); (4) Wisdom (paññā); (5) Firmness (viriya): (6) Patience (khanti); (7) Truth (sacca); (8) Resolution (adhiṭṭhāna): (9) Kindness (mettā); (10) Equanimity (upekkhā).[1]

Without these Ten perfections, past, present and future Buddha, could not, cannot and will not, obtain Buddhahood. Again, if we look at the Mahāyāna Sūtras[2] we will meet with the 'Ten virtues of perfection' (daśapāramita) which are :—

(1) The Virtue of charity (dāna); (2) the Virtue of good conduct (śila); (3) the Virtue of patience (kṣānti); (4) the Virtue of firmness (virya); (5) the Virtue of meditation (dhyāna); (6) the Virtue of wisdom (prajñā); (7) . the Virtue of skilfulness (upāya); (8) the Virtue of

[1] Buddhist Birth Stories p liii See also Pāli Dictionary by Childers, pp 334-335 See also Nidāna-Kathā, VV 125-126 And this also find in the Vimokṣamārga-śāstra composed by Upatiṣya or Sāriputra, translated by Saṅghapāla, A D 505 of the Liaṅ Dynasty A D 502-557 in 12 fasciculi, 12 chapter. (Ch'ang Bundle, Vol. 3, p 53a, Chinese Tripiṭaka)

[2] Suvikrāntavikrami-paripṛccha in Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras, etc.

determined will (pranidhāna); (9) the Virtue of strength (bala); (10) the Virtue of knowledge (jñāna).

The formation of the above Ten-pāramitās of Mahāyāna Sūtra is almost identical with the Ten-pāramitās of the Cariya-pitaka of the Original form of Buddhism. And the difference between these two is that the former deals with religious practices, leading to perfection for the self only, while the latter is for the self, as well as for others. This is the essential point of difference between the Original form of Buddhism (or Hīnayāna) and the Developed form of Buddhism (or Mahāyāna).

One chapter in Chinese translation of the Avatamsaka-sūtras, entitled 'Daśabhūmi-sūtra,'[1] deals with the explanation of 'Daśa-bhumi' or Ten-stages of Bodhisattva's religious practices which are as follow;—

(1) The delighted stage (pramuditā-bhumi); (2) The purified stage (vimala-bhūmi); (3) The illuminated stage (prabhākarī); (4) The inflamed stage (arcismatī); (5) the invincible stage (sudurjayā); (6) The stage in the direction of (abhimukhī); (7) The far advanced stage (dūrangamā); (8) The immovable stage (acalā); (9) The stage of good intelligence (sādhumatī), (10) The stage of clouds of dharma (dharmameghā).[2]

These Ten Bodhisattva stages do not represent the stages of religious practices of the former lines of Sakyamuni Buddha, but of all human beings, who exercise

[1] It seems that this chapter of the Avatamsaka-sūtra has been regarded as very important among the ancient Mahāyānists in India, as well as in China In India, this has been used independently of the Avatamsaka-sūtras and for this reason, I think, in Nepal this has been counted as one of 'Nine dharmas,' see S B E., Vol XXI, p I It has been said that there were four or five commentaries on this, however, at present we have only two of them, one is the 'Daśabhūmi-vibhāṣā-śāstra' by Nāgārjuna, while the other is the 'Daśabhūmi-sūtra-śāstra' by Vasubandhu It is also very interesting to note here, that there was one Buddhist sect in China entitled 'Bhūmi-śāstra sect' before the Sui and the Thān Dynasty This sect was established upon the doctrine of this sūtra and those śastras

[2] See Appendix

Mahāyānic religious practices. Because, from the Mahāyānic point of view, every human being is Bodhisattva. The description of the Ten-stages of Bodhisattva in the Daśabhūmi chapter of the Avatamsaka-sūtras is much complicated and highly advanced in every respect. And such form came into existence at a much later time. However, if we study a bit carefully the original form of these Ten stages, we will easily arrive at the conclusion that these stages were originally formed on the basis of the 'Ten perfect virtues' (daśa-pāramitā). Or, to be more precise, it may be said that the Dasa-bhūmis are nothing but the systematized form of the Daśa-pāramitā. This might be the reason, why in the very statement of Daśa-bhūmi chapter of Avataṁsaka-sūtra, Buddha preached these Ten-stages of Bodhisattva along with the Daśa-pāramitās :—

1. In the Joyful stage (pramuditā), Bodhisattva should practise mainly the virtue of charity (dāna-pāramītā).

2. In the Immaculate stage (vimala), Bodhisattvas have to practise mainly the virtue of morality (Śila-pāramitā).

3. In the Shining stage (prabhākarī), Bodhisattvas have to practise chiefly the virtue of patience (kṣanti-pāramitā).

4. In the Radiant stage (archismatī), Bodhisattvas have to practise chiefly the virtue of energy (virya-pāramitā).

5. In the Invincible stage (sudurjayā), Bodhisattvas have to practise chiefly the virtue of trances (dhyāna-pāramitā).

6. In the Turned-towards stage (abhimukhi), Bodhisattvas have to practise mainly the virtue of wisdom (Prajñā-pāramitā)

7. In the Far-going stage (durangamā), Bodhisattvas have to practise mainly the virtue of the means (upāyakauśala-pāramitā)

8. In the Immovable stage (acalā), Bodhisattvas have to practise chiefly the virtue of resolves (pranidhana-pāramitā).

9. In the Good Knowledge stage (sādhumatī), Bodhisattvas chiefly practise the virtue of strength (bala-pāramitā)

10. In the stage of cloud of the dharma (dharma-meghā), Bodhisattvas have to practise chiefly the virtue of knowledge (Jñāna-pāramitā).

Regarding this point, we find a very interesting and important statement in the Mādhyamikāvatāra of Chandrakīrti. There Chandrakīrti[1] established an intimate connection between the 'bhumis' and the 'pāramitās' in following way[2]:—

(1) The joyful stage (pramuditā) is the domain of the Virtue of charity (dāna).

(2) The Immaculate stage (vimala) is the domain of the Virtue of morality (śīla).

(3) The shining stage (prabhākarī) is the domain of the Virtue of four trances (dhyāna).

(4) The Radiant stage (archismatī) is the domain of the Virtue of energy (Virya).

(5) The Invincible stage (sudurjayā) is the domain of the Virtue of patience (ksanti).

(6) The stage of Turned-towards (abhimukhī) is the domain of the Virtue of wisdom (prajñā).

(7) The Far-going stage (durangamā) is the domain of the Virtue of means (upāyakauśala).

(8) The Immovable stage (acalā) is the domain of the Virtue of resolves (pranidhāna)

(9) The stage of good knowledge (sādhumatī) is the domain of the Virtue of strength (bala).

[1] He is one of the great teachers of Mādhyamika school in 6th century A.D.

[2] Full statement has been recapitulated by Prof. L de la Vallée Poussin in E R E., Vol 2, p 748 I have extracted this statement from there.

(10) The stage of 'cloud of law' (dharmameghā) is the domain of the Virtue of knowledge (jñāna).

If we compare this statement with that of the Daśabhūmi chapter of Avataṁsaka-sūtra we shall understand at once that the intimate connection shown by Chandrakīrtī is quite proper and is, no doubt, the result of this careful study of the Daśabhūmi chapter of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra Again, regarding this point, we should not overlook an important account of the Mahāvastu which has been regarded as a Vinaya book of the Lokottaravādin of Mahāsanghika schools. There we come across the description of the Ten stages (dasabhūmi), quite independent from those of the Daśabhūmi chapter of the Avatamsaka-sūtra. Those Ten stages are:—(1) The stage difficult to attain (durārohā), (2) The stage of fastening (baddhamānā); (3) The stage adorned with flowers (pushpamanditā); (4) The attractive stage (rucira); (5) The stage of expansion of heart (cittavistāra); (6) The stage where one possessed lovely body (rupāvati); (7) The stage difficult to conquer (durjaya); (8) The stage of the ascertainment of birth (janmanideśa); (9) The stage of installation as crown-prince (yauvarāja); (10) The stage of coronation (abhisheka)[1]

Both the names and characteristics[2] of each stage are quite independent of those of Daśabhūmi chapter of Avataṁsaka-sūtra. However, this seems to be the most primitive form of the Ten-stages of Bodhisattva as we

[1] Full description has been given by Senart in his introduction of Le Mahāvastu, p xxvii, and Mahāvastu itself, Vol. I, p 75 ff See also Nepalese Buddhist literature by Dr R Mitra, p 116

[2] The Daśabhūmi or the Ten stages in the career of the Bodhisattva in the Mahāvastu are only for the particular persons who are already predicted by a Buddha as would-be Buddhas. And there these Ten-stages have been explained by a reference to the history of Śākyamuni Buddha While those Ten stages in the Daśabhūmi chapter of Avatamsaka sūtra are not only for the particular persons but for every human being carrying Mahāyānic religious practices

find in the Buddhist literatures The Ten-stages (daśabhūmi) of Avatamsaka-sūtras, as I have said before, are the systematized forms of the Ten-perfect virtues (daśapāramitā) viewed with reference to their internal characteristics However, formation of these Ten-stages, we may believe, depends on the Daśabhūmi of the Mahāvastu. Concerning this point I am very glad to find that the same opinion is expressed by Prof L. de la Vallée Poussin in his learned article on the 'Mahāyāna.'[1]

The foregoing discussions enable us to say that there was an inseparable connection between the Daśapāramitā of the Original form of Buddhism and that of the Developed Buddhism, and between the Ten-stages (daśabhūmi) of Avatamsaka-sūtra and the Ten-perfect virtues (daśapāramitā) as well as the Ten-stages (daśabhūmi) of the Mahāvastu. Therefore, from historical point of view the Mahāyānic Daśabhūmi of the Bodhisattva came into being through the Mahāyānic Daśapāramitā as well as the Daśabhūmi of Mahāvastu, and was moreover, connected with the 'Vimala-citta' doctrine of the Mahāsanghika school. That is to say, adepts of the Mahāsanghika school penetrated into Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perceptions, but not being satisfied with the Daśabhūmi of Mahāvastu, as not being common to all people, at last formed the Daśabhūmi of the Avatamsaka, accessible to all, having the said threefold foundations, for its bases

According to the 'I-pu-tsun-lun-lun' of Vasumitra, the doctrine that "all beings are Bodhisattva" was not held by the Mahāsanghikas in the original stage of their separation from the Sthaviras, just one hundred years after the Parinirvāna of Buddha; but there can be no doubt, that the doctrine came into being within two hundred years after the demise of the master, that is to

[1] E R. E, Vol 8, p 336

say, about the time when the Ekovyavahārika, Lokattaravādin and Kokkutika—the offshoots of the Mahāsanghika school—separated each other from the original school. As to the cause of this separation, according to the statement of Paramārtha, it has been said that original Mahāsanghika school incorporated at that time, Prajñāpāramitā and Avatamsaka-sūtras, etc, into their scriptures. Some thought it right while others were against it, and in consequence separation took place. But according to me, the real fact signified by this tradition was that those Prajñāpāramitā and Avataṁsaka-sūtras were not independently composed by any man or any school other than the Mahāsāṅghikas. That is to say the Mahāsanghikas after penetrating into Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception manifested the doctrine, for the first time in Sūtra form under the man of Prajñāpāramitā, Avatamsaka-sūtras, etc But as the doctrine itself originally existed in Buddha's perception, so they wanted and at the same time they thought it quite proper to state those Sūtras as Būddha's direct preaching I think such was the common tendency among the Buddha's disciples and followers

Now, let us see how the original Mahāsanghika school began to hold the idea that "All human beings are Bodhisattvas." As we know, the original Mahāsanghikas held the 'Super-human' Buddhalogy And this doctrine has been manifested in complete form in the Avatamsaka-sūtras Again, also we know that they held the doctrine of 'Anādi-ananta-vimala-citta' which has been manifested fully in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras Those great thinkers of the Mahāsanghika school did not stop their investigation there but gradually pushed themselves forward into more advanced stages and at last they combined together the idea of 'Anādi-ananta-vimala-citta,' with the Buddhalogy of 'Super-human' and gave out that

this 'Vimala-citta,' possessed by all human beings is the germ of Buddhahood for future. This 'germ,' in other words, is the 'nature of Bodhisattva.' Hence they began to hold the idea "All human beings are Bodhisattvas." Again, carrying on their investigation further they formed the idea that all human beings originally possessed the nature of Buddha—nay, they were originally Buddha. Such ideas of them are clearly manifested in the Mahāyāna Sūtras, specially in the Avatamsaka and the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtras So it is said in the Avatamsaka-sūtra :—

"At that time Tathāgata, penetrating all beings in Universe (dharma-dātu) with the pure eyes of knowledge without any hindrance, said thus:—O wondered! wondered! Those all beings possessed Tathāgata-knowledge, however, being ignorant, they did not know and did not understand what they really were? Therefere, I should teach them the noble right fold paths in order to destroy their hindrance of ignorance perpetually, and having exercised the noble right-fold paths they would obtain the Tathāgata-knowledge."[1]

Again, in the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra, it has been said :—

"This, O Sāriputra, is the sole object, the sole aim, the sole purpose of his appearance in the world, such then, Sāriputra, is the sole object, the sole aim, the lofty object, the lofty aim of the Tathāgata. And it is achieved by the Tathāgata for, Sāriputra, I do show all creatures the sight of Tathāgata-knowledge ; I do open the eyes of creatures for the sight of Tathāgata-knowledge, Sāriputra ; I do firmly establish the teaching of Tathāgata-knowledge on the right path.[2]

[1] Tien Bundle, Vol III, p 43, Chinese Tripiṭaka

[2] S B E, Vol. XXI, p 40.

According to me such lofty ideas were investigated and manifested by the Mahāsanghikas during the period from their separation to first century A.D approximately. The Mahāsanghikas thus coined the term 'Bodhisattvayāna' or 'Buddhayāna.' They thought it to be a more suitable term to distinguish themselves from the Sthaviras in point of doctrine and at the same time to assert their own superiority. And they called their opponent by the term 'Arahatyāna' or 'Śrāvakayāna,' which indicates that by this vehicle, men could attain only to 'Arhatship' but not 'Bodhisattvahood,' not to speak of Buddhahood.

(3) *The term Mahāyāna*

In the oldest Mahāyāna Sūtras, such as the Saddharma--puṇḍarīka-sūtra, some portion of the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra and some portion of Avataṃsaka-sūtras, we come across the terms 'Ekayāna,' 'Bodhisattvayāna' and 'Buddhayāna,' more frequently than the term 'Mahāyāna' which is used not in the sense of comparison. While in the later Mahāyāna Sūtras, the term Mahāyāna occurs more frequently than those terms and there this term has been used in the sense of comparison From such application, it appears to me that the term 'Mahāyāna' came into being in its current sense at a much later time. For, as I have already discussed, when the Mahāsanghikas found that the term 'Ekayāna' was common to both the Sthaviras and the Mahāsanghikas and that it indicated Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception (which the Mahāsanghikas wanted to manifest) and at the same time Buddha's Phenomenological doctrine (which the Sthaviras loyally adhered to), they began to search for another suitable term to serve their purpose and as a result 'Bodhisattvayāna' and 'Buddhayāna' were coined Again after some time they came to know that

it indicated Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception on his 'own personality' as well as 'human life.' But this is only one aspect of his perception and not the entirety of it. If Buddha's full Introspectional and Ontological perceptions are to be expressed by a single term, it should be necessary to find out such a term as can indicate both the aspects of Buddha's perception on the 'cosmic existence' as well as on 'human life.' Thus again the Mahāsanghikas began to seek for a suitable term and at last they coined the term 'Mahāyāna' to be applied to themselves and the term 'Hīnayāna' for their opponents with a view to indicate the superiority of their own doctrine. As a matter of fact, it seems that these terms fulfilled their intentions for both purposes, that is to say, the term, on the one hand, fairly distinguished them so far as doctrine and religious practices were concerned, while, on the other hand, the term 'Mahāyāna' exactly indicated the sense of both the term 'Ekayāna' and 'Buddhayāna.' For example, in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra, it has been said —

> "For the men of Mahāyāna, the supreme way has been shown."[1]

Again, in the same Sūtra —

> "Six-pāramitās are the Mahāyāna of the Bodhisattva."[2]

Again, in the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra :—

> "In like manner, Kāsyapa, is there but one vehicle, viz., Mahāyāna.[3] there is no second vehicle, no third"[4]

[1] Yüch Bundle, Vol 8, p 67b of Chinese Tripitaka

[2] Yüch Bundle, Vol I, p 20b

[3] There are six manuscripts in Sanskrit, three among them mentioned the word 'Mahāyāna,' while others mentioned the word 'Buddhayāna' in the place of Mahāyāna

[4] See S B E, XXI, p 129

Again, in the Avatamsaka-sūtra.—

> "Desire, O monks, all people in the Mahāyāna can accomplish 'Sarvajñāna-mārga' without any hindrance and also desire, O monks, all people can arrive at the region of bliss by that Sarvajñāna-yāna."[1]

Again, in the Samādhirāja-sūtra —

> "With the object of attaining a Buddha's knowledge, I adore the Mahāyāna (great vehicle), which is neither destroyed nor made, which is devoid of stains and which cannot be described by words, I repeatedly bow down to the Mahāyāna, which is devoid of any contingency, non-conditioned, uncreated, and reverenced by the Buddhists"[2]

Again, in the Amitāyurdhyāna-sūtra it has been said:—

> "O my son in the law, thou hast practised the Mahāyāna doctrine, thou hast understood and believed the highest truth; therefore I now come to meet and welcome thee"[3]

The above quotations show clearly that the term 'Mahāyāna' has been applied in the sense of 'Ekayāna,' that is to say, it indicates Buddha's Ontological doctrine. On the other hand, it expresses other sense also, for example, in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra:—

"The Bodhisattvas put on the armour of Mahāyāna, ornamented themselves with Mahāyāna and lived in the Mahāyāna."[4]

Again, in the same Sūtra —

> "The Bodhisattvayāna is the Mahāyāna."[5] Such statements are met with several times in the same Sūtras as well as Avatamsaka-sūtras.[6]

[1] Tien Bundle, Vol 2, p 23*a*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[2] Samādhirāja-sūtra, p I (B T S Edition)

[3] S B E, Vol XLIX, Pt 3, p 190

[4] Yuoh Bundle, Vol 7, p. 4*a*

[5] Yüch Bundle, Vol I, p 18*a*

[6] Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra, Yuch Bundle, Vol 3, pp 24*b*, 25*a*, 26*b*, And Avatamsaka sūtra, Vol. I, p 18*a* Tien Bundle, Vol 2, p 21*b*, Vol 9, 6*b*

Again, in the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra :—

> "Those who are learning Mahāyāna, though possessing human eye, yet are said to be endowed with the eye of Buddha Since the 'Mahāyāna' has been called 'Buddhayāna.'[1]

The above quotation clearly shows that the term 'Mahāyāna' has been sometimes used to signify the term 'Buddhayāna,' that is to say, it sometimes expresses Buddha's Ontological perception on his 'own personality' as wel as on 'human life'

Our next important discussion is to see how the Mahāsanghikas found out the term 'Mahāyāna.'

As we already discussed that when the Buddha obtained the absolute wisdom he realized himself as Buddha having no beginning and no end. At the same time, he, through his perception, could realise that all human beings possessed equal personality. The Mahāsanghikas easily realized this deepest and highest perception and manifested it in their doctrines, and at the same time established: "All human beings possess Bodhisattvahood or Buddhahood" Here, the very word 'All' is the most important one regarding the origination of the term 'Mahāyāna' The term 'Mahāyāna' means the 'Great Vehicle.' Then what does the word 'Great' signify here? It is the 'Vehicle' which can carry all human beings, and has, therefore, been called 'Great' The word 'All,' again, has sometimes been expressed in the Mahāyāna Sūtras, by the term 'Asaṁkhya' or numberless.

According to the Original form of Buddhism or Hīnayāna, the cultured men only attained the Arhatship and Pratyeka-Buddhahood, but not all human beings, while, on the contrary, according to Developed or Mahāyāna Buddhism, all human beings or numberless

[1] In Bundle, Vol 5, p 29a of Chinese Tripitaka

beings can equally attain Buddhahood. In other words, through the 'doctrine' or 'yāna,' 'all' or 'numberless,' human beings will understand that they possess the germ of 'Buddha-hood.' And at the same time by the same, 'all' or numberless human beings can realize their Buddhahood. Hence Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological doctrine or Developed Buddhism has been termed as 'Mahāyāna' or 'great vehicle.' This idea is clearly expressed in the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra:—

"एवमुक्ते आयुष्मान् सुभूतिर्भगवन्तमेतदवोचत्। महायानं महायानमिति भगवन्नुच्यते। सदेवमानुषासुरलोकमभिभवन्निर्यास्यति आकाशसमतया अतिमहत्तया तन्महायानं॥ यथाकाशे अप्रमेयाणामसंख्येयानां सत्वानं अवकाशः एवमेव भगवन्नस्मिन् याने अप्रमेयाणामसंख्येयानां सत्वानामवकाशः॥ अनेन भगवन् पर्य्यायेण महायानमिदम्बोधिसत्त्वानं महासत्वानां। नैवास्यागमोदृश्यते नैवास्य निर्गमो दृश्यते नाप्यस्य स्थाने संविद्यते। एवमस्य भगवन् महायानस्य नैव पूर्व्वान्त उपलभ्यते नाप्यपरान्त उपलभ्यते नापि मध्य उपलभ्यते। अथसमं मगवंस्तद्यानं महायानमित्युच्यते॥"[1]

"After this had been said the long-lived Subhūti spoke thus to the Lord. O Lord! Mahāyāna is called the Mahā-yāna (great vehicle). It is called Mahāyāna because it will lead gods men and demons, being as spacious as the sky. Just as the sky may be a receptacle for immeasurable and innumerable objects, so also, O Lord, this vehicle (yāna) is a receptacle for immense and innumerable sentient beings (sattvas). In this speech, O Lord, the Mahāyāna is to be understood to be a receptacle for the Bodhisattvas alone. It is not seen whence it comes, whether it goes, and where it stops. Thus O Lord, neither the beginning, nor end, nor middle

[1] Bibliotheca Indica Edition, p. 24.

of the Mahāyāna is perceptible. This vehicle (yāna), O Lord, is of equal dimensions throughout. It is for these reasons that the Mahāyāna is called Mahāyāna. "Great vehicle."

Exactly the same statement is found in the Daśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra in Chinese translation.[1]

Thus, at last Mahāsanghikas coined the term 'Mahāyāna' for themselves in order to show their doctrinal superiority, and at the same time they found out, in the same process, the term 'Hīnayāna' for their opponents to indicate their inferiority. Hence the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' came into use.

Our next question is as to when these terms came into being? As we discussed above, the term 'Ekayāna' came to be used, at first, after the separation of the 'Mahāsanghikas' from the Sthaviras. The next term 'Bodhisattvayāna' or 'Buddhayāna' was found out about the time when the first separation took place in the Mahāsanghika school within two hundred years after Buddha's Parinirvāṇa.

According to me, the term 'Mahāyāna' was coined just after 'Buddhayāna' or 'Bodhisattvayāna' came to be used. But we should bear in mind that the indication of the term 'Mahāyāna' at that time was different from that of its later use. That is to say, at first it was used in the place of the term 'Ekayāna' as well as the term 'Buddhayāna' and thus we find, for example, in the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra stated:—

"In like manner, Kāsyapa, is there but one vehicle, *viz.*, Mahāyāna: there is no second vehicle, and no third."[2]

Here the term 'Mahāyāna' is used in the place of Ekayāna."

[1] Yuch Bundle, Vol 8, p 11, of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

[2] S. B E, Vol XXI, p 120

In the same Sūtra :—

"These ones may be said to be those who, coveting the vehicle, fly from the triple world. Therefore, they are called Bodhisattvas, Mahāsattvas."[1] Here the term 'Mahāyāna' is used in the place 'Bodhisattvayāna.'

Again, in the same Sūtra :—

"The Tathāgata, the Arhat, considering that he possesses great wealth of knowledge, power, and absence of hesitation, and that all beings are his children, leads them by no other vehicle than the Buddha-vehicle to full development."[2]

Here, the term 'Buddhayāna' means 'Mahāyāna.' The above quotations show clearly that the term 'Mahāyāna' did not signify any comparison. However, in the later Mahāyāna Sūtras, the term 'Mahāyāna' has been used in comparison with the term 'Hīnayāna.' For example, in the Suvikrāntavikrami-paripricchā of the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra which is regarded to be a much later work, it is said :—

"It indicates the supreme way for the men of 'Mahāyāna' and does not preach the way of the Śrāvakas as well as Pratyeka Buddhas.

It indicates the way of the Śrāvakas so far as the men who are practising the Hīnayāna are concerned and shows the Great way to men who desire to conduct the Mahāyāna."[3]

Again, in the Avatamsaka-sūtra :—

"Perpetually give up the Hīnayāna and desire earnestly the Mahāyāna."[4]

[1] S B E, Vol XXI, p 80

[2] *Ibid*, p 81

[3] Yuch Bundle, Vol 8, p 67*b* And the same expression can be found in the same Bundle and the same Vol., p 68*a*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

[4] Tien Bundle, Vol. 9, p 5*b*

Again, in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra :—

"Desire all people to light the light of Mahāyāna and put down the light of Hīnayāna." [1]

Such comparison of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' was vigorously pushed forward at the time of Nāgārjuna and later on. I shall make this point clear in the next chapter.

[1] In Bundle, Vol. 5, p 77*a*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

PART II

CHAPTER I

The different applications of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' in the two periods of the making of Mahāyāna Buddhism (or Mahāyāna sūtra period) and of Mahāyāna teachers (or Mahāyāna school period).

In the first part, we have made a historical study of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' from various points of view and thereby we have sought to indicate the line of the Original Mahāyāna Buddhism as well as its gradual manifestation.

In this part, we are going to discuss varied applications of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' at different times by the many teachers of manifold Mahāyāna schools. Roughly the period runs from the beginning of the second century A.D. to the seventh century A.D. In other words from the time of Aśvaghosa I, down to the teachers of the Nālandā period

But before we enter into this question we have at first one thing to discuss here which is of vital importance regarding the subject matter of our present inquiry. We should note here the different implications of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' at the respective time of the Mahāyāna Sūtra and Mahāyāna school periods.

In the Mahāyāna Sūtra period (or as I designate it Mahāyāna manifesting period) we find the term 'Mahāyāna' mainly used in the sense of 'disclosing or unfolding one's own real doctrines,' having not the least indication of 'rejecting the other doctrines.' At the same time the terms 'Mahāvāna' in relation to that of

'Hīnayāna' indicates only the relation of Buddha's Ontological and Phenomenological perceptions respectively. But in the Mahāyāna school period, specially in the time of Nāgārjuna, these terms began to be used more in the sense of 'rejecting' other's doctrines, as a fundamental feature, than merely 'disclosing one's own doctrines.' Again, from the time of Nāgārjuna the above terms began not only to be used as indications of a sense of relationship between the Buddha's Ontological and Phenomenological perceptions but also they were applied to strike out a comparison of one school with another. So that, in this period, Sthaviravāda on the one hand, the Sarvāstivāda with their allied schools as well as, that of the Mahāsanghikas even on the other (which was the fore-runner of Mahāyānism) were included in the scope of 'Hīnayāna.' While the Mādhyamika school of Nāgārjuna, Yogācāra school of Maitreyanātha, Asaṅga, Vasubandhu and of Aśvaghosa II did alone come under the scope of 'Mahāyāna.' This is clear from the following passage of Nāgārjuna's Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra:—

"The doctrines of Hīnayāna mainly dealt with the idea of impermanence. While those of Mahāyānas chiefly expostulate the idea that 'all existence is śūnyatā' (or Dharma śūnyatā). In other words, in Hīnayāna at first, the idea of impermanence has been preached but afterwards, the idea of 'Dharma-śūnyatā' also came in. While in Mahāyāna from the very beginning, idea of 'Dharma-śūnyatā' has been preached."[1]

We should carefully mark here that the first portion of the statement, *i.e.*, "In Hīnayāna at first, the idea of impermanence has been preached" is evidently alluding to the Sthavira doctrines or the school of Sarvāstivāda, while the latter portion, *i.e.*, "But afterwards the idea

[1] Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra, 69 fasciculi, Wang Bundle, Vol 4, p 46a, of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

of 'Dharma-śūnayata' also came in" is a distinct allusion to the doctrines of the Mahāsanghikas.

As we already know, the Sthaviras held that all existence is impermanent The Sarvāstivādins went a little further and opined that although all existence is impermanent yet the atomic elements are permanent. The Mahāsanghikas again held that both cosmic existence as well as atomic elements are impermanent. This latter idea of Mahāsanghikas is fairly stated in the commentary of the Nikāya-avalambana-śāstra (Pu-chih-i-lun) by Paramārtha as the doctrine of Ekavyavahārika:—

"Ekavyavahārikas held that all existences in this world (loka = phenomenon) as well as in the super-world (uttaraloka = noumenon) are temporary, so that all existences (dharmas) have no reality."[1]

Again, if we look at the Buddha-svabhāva-śāstra[2] by Vasubandhu, we will come to know that the Mahāsanghika school was included within the scope of 'Hīnayāna,' an extract from which runs thus:—

"Every school in Hīnayāna has its distinct opinions and specific interpretations If we look at the doctrines of the Vibhājyavādins, we see that they preach that 'śūnyatā' is the *origin* of all human beings—both wise and ignorant. Because, these classes of men all came into being out of the same 'śūnyatā.' This 'śūnyatā' is the 'nature of Buddha' (Buddha-svabhāva), and this Buddha-svabhāva is the Mahānirvāṇa. Again, if we look at the doctrines of Sarvāstivāda schools, we see all these schools preaching that all human beings do not possess originally, the 'nature of Buddha' (Buddha-svabhāva), but it can be obtained by religious practices."[3]

[1] The original book has been lost I have quoted these passages from San-lan-gen-gi, Vol I, p 51

[2] This book was translated by Paramārtha (557 569 A D) See Nanjio's Catalogue, p. 268, No 1220

[3] Shu Bundle, Vol 2, p. 74*b*, of Chinese Tripitaka

In this statement, the term 'Vibhājyavādin' indicates the Mahāsanghika school. Etymologically, 'Vibhājyavādin' means 'one who follows the analytic method of enquiry.' From the Pāli Nikāyas we came to know that the expression 'Vibhājyavādin' originally implied Buddha's analytic method of enquiry.

In the Majjhima Nikāya,[1] Buddha declares himself to be a 'Vibhājyavādin' and not an 'Ekāmsavādin' indicating thereby that his method of teaching was analytic and not synthetic According to Southern and Northern Buddhist sources sthaviras with their allied schools were Vibhājyavādins.[2] But in Chinese translations of Northern Buddhist Books, we find that the term Vibhājyavādin sometimes implied the Mahāsanghikas. The above-quoted passage is a sure evidence of this Again the same expression is used in Abhidharma-mahāvibhāsa-śāstra[3] of the Sarvāstivādins. It has been stated there that :—"some (school) is holding that 'Citta is originally pure' just as the Vibhājyavādins do."[4] But we know, already that the doctrine of 'Anādi-ananta-vimal-acitta,' is a distinct Mahāsanghika tenet Therefore, it is not very difficult to conclude that in the above statement, the term 'Vibhājyavādin' implies Mahāsanghikas and also that the Mahāsanghika school came under the scope of 'Hīnayāna.' Again, if we look at the record of Fa-Hien who came to India during the fourth century A.D. we find the following :—

"Students of the Mahāyāna present offerings to the Prajñāpāramitā and to Mañjuśri."[5]

[1] M N, II 99, p 197

[2] See Dr Oldenberg's Introduction to the Vinaya Piṭaka, Vol I, p. xlii, and Mrs Rhys Davids's Introduction to the English translation of Katha-vattu

[3] See Nanjio's catalogue, p 277, No 1261

[4] Shu Bundle, Vol 2, p 7a, of Chinese Tripitaka

[5] Fa-hien by Legge, p 46

This does not supply any direct evidence for our purpose. But we have here an indirect implication that, at Fa-Hien's time, the Mahāsanghika school already had been included in the 'Hīnayāna.' Again, I-Tsing who travelled through India in the seventh century A.D. gives us the following :—

"Those who worship the Bodhisattvas and read the Mahāyāna Sūtras are called the Mahāyāna (the great). While those who do not perform those are called Hīnayāna (the small) There are but two kinds of the so-called Mahāyāna, first the Mādhyamika, second the Yoga."[1]

This also is not direct evidence. But from this, we understand clearly that, at the time of I-Tsing, Mādhyamika and Yogācāra schools only were regarded as Mahāyāna Therefore, it is no wonder that all other Buddhist schools would naturally at that time, come under 'Hīnayāna.' Thus, from the above discussion, it becomes clear that the implication of the term 'Mahāyāna' and its relation with 'Hīnayāna' had changed widely in the interval between the Mahāyāna Sūtra period and Mahāyāna school period.

Now this will naturally lead to such a question as how did the Mahāsanghika school came to be included into the scope of 'Hīnayāna' at the Mahāyāna school period ? In answer to this, I would like to say that the Mahāsanghika and its allied schools just began the task of manifesting Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception into a doctrinal form. They also expressed those doctrines by such terms as 'Ekayāna,' Bodhisattvayāna, 'Buddhayāna' and at last by 'Mahāyāna.' While, on the contrary, at the same time they, with a strong sense of superiority, termed the doctrine of their opponents or

[1] I-Tsing, by Dr. J Takakusu, p 15

Sthaviras by 'Dviyāna,' 'Arhatyāna,' and at last by 'Hīnayāna' in order to perpetuate a well-marked mutual distinction. But when, in course of time, the Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception was revealed, expressed and systematised more and more by brilliant men of the lineage of later Mahāsanghikas, a necessity arose to differentiate the earlier and later movements. The later line of the Mahāsanghikas was disposed to include the original Mahāsanghika school under the head of 'Hīnayāna'

Let us continue the above discussion a little further in a concrete form

Pūrnayaśa a teacher of the later Mahāsanghika line the elder contemporary of Aśvaghosa I, held a little more advanced ideas than those of the original Mahāsanghikas We come to know of his tenets from his discourses with Aśvaghosa I, embodied thus in 'Pu-fa-tsân-yin-yuen-kin[1] :—

"There are two standpoints from which to explain the existence. From the Conventional (samunta-satya) points of view 'existence' is nothing but simply a provisional name While from the Transcendental (paramārthā-satya) point of view every existence is 'śūnya'"[2]

The life of Aśvaghoṣa I, shows that he was influenced by the teacher Pārsva and became a Buddhist. But according to the historical record 'Fu-fa-tsân-yin-yuen-kin' he obtained real perception through the teacher Pūrṇayaśa which reason, I think, led him in the beginning of his Sūtrālankāra-śāstra to offer a salutation first to Pūrnayaśa and then to Bhikṣu Pārsva. This is a clear indication to prove that he belonged to the Mahāsanghika

[1] Translated by Ci cia-ye together with Thân-yâo, 472 A D of the Northern Wei dynasty, 386 534 A D In 6 fasciculi This is a very well-known history of the succession of twenty three patriarchs from Mahākāsyapa to the Bhikṣu Simha (see Nanjio's Catalogue, p 298 No 1340)

[2] Ch'ang Bundle, Vol 9 p 105b, of Chinese Tripitaka

lineage. Aśvaghosa I, again lays down his fundamental doctrine in the 'Śāstra on the meaning of Anātmā in Dharma asked by a Nirgrantha,' there too he is seen to consider existence in general from two points of view, *i.e.*, from the point of Saṁvṛtasatya, all things exist in different ways in different positions; again, from the point of Paramārthasatya no such things (of the said descriptions) exist But beyond these Dharma-tathatā exists which has no birth and no death being originally pure "[1]

Regarding Nāgārjuna, it has been stated in the 'Fu-fâ-tsân-yuen-kin' that he received instruction from Kapimala who was of the same line as Aśvaghosa I. From an examination of doctrines we are also convinced that Nāgārjuna undoubtedly was of the Mahāsanghika lineage. We know he established 'Sarva-śūnyatā' doctrine which was based directly upon Mahāyāna Sūtras, specially, Prajnāpāramitā-sūtras and indirectly was nothing but a fairly systematized and much advanced form of original Mahāsanghika tenets.

It is needless to mention that the followers of Mādhyamika school like Âryadeva undoubtedly sided with Nāgārjuna in doctrinal matters We learn nothing of Maitreyanātha the founder of Yogācāra school from 'Fu-fâ-tân-yuen-kin' and other historical records and consequently it is very difficult to trace his previous connections. However, from the doctrinal point of view we clearly understand that his ideas had been much influenced by the 'Vimal-citta' doctrine of the original Mahāsanghikas. Maitreyanātha as we know established the Yogācāra school upon the basis of Mahāyāna Sūtras like Avatamsaka-sūtra, Lankāvatāra-sūtra, Sandhinirmocana-sūtra, etc. And these

[1] Ch'en Bundle Vol 9, p 3a, of Chinese Tripitaka

Sūtras as I have stated before, were propounded by Mahāsanghika school men. Therefore, of him it may be said that indirectly he too belonged to the Mahāsanghika line. His doctrine of 'Vijñāpti-mātra' or 'Sarva-vijñāna' from a certain point of view may be called a systematized form of 'Vimala-citta' doctrine of original Mahāsanghikas. Asanga, Vasubandhu and other followers of the same school may be said in the same light to be indebted to the Mahāsanghikas although their doctrines were only a step further than those of Maitreyanātha. Thus, the doctrines of 'Asanskrita dharma' as well as 'Anādi-ananta-vimala-citta' of original Mahāsanghikas as well as their Buddhalogy were gradually amplified by the Lokottaravādins and Ekavyavahārikas of the same line. Again, a further advanced stage was reached by Pūrṇayasa and Aśvaghosa I. At the time of Nāgārjuna of the Mādhyamika school and of Maitreyanātha of Yogācara school and their respective followers the above doctrines were developed to a still greater extent Thus the 'Anātmā-adharma' doctrine of the Mahāsanghikas was elaborated by Nāgārjuna under the term of 'Sarva-śūnyatā' doctrine, and that of 'Asanskrita-dharma' under the name of 'Dharma-tathatā' While the 'Vimala-citta' doctrine of the Mahāsanghikas was fully developed by Maitreyanātha under the name of 'Sarva-vijñāna' as well as 'Vimala svabhāva-nirvāna' doctrines. At last, as the last logical stage Aśvaghosa II, one of the greatest Mahāyāna teachers combined together in a perfect whole both the doctrines of Mādhyamikas and Yogācāras under such a title as 'Bhūtatathatā' or 'suchness' doctrine.

In other words, Nāgārjuna's doctrines mainly treat of the problem 'the determination of what constitutes the substance of reality.' While Maitreyanātha's doctrines mainly touch the problem of 'the determination of the relation between reality and cognition' And both these

points of view have been combined together by Aśvaghoṣa II.[1]

In this way, the doctrines of the Mahāsanghika school were formulated, developed and advanced step by step by different teachers of the same lineage and were, at the last stage of the whole Mahāsanghika movement, transformed into what is generally known as Mahāyāna Buddhism. The upholders of the latter system finally called themselves Mahāyānists. They went to the extent of including into the scope of 'Hīnayāna' the original Mahāsaṅghikas and their allied schools.

Besides this, there was another reason for this inclusion of the Mahāsanghikas within the scope of 'Hīnayāna.' About the time of Nāgārjuna and afterwards, the question of the religieux, religious practices, as well as final salvation became all important among the different schools of Buddhism. So that the Mahāyānists naturally were busily engaged to strike out comparisons among different forms of the Buddhist faith on the said points. The terms 'Mahāyāna,' and 'Hīnayāna' were used in this connection. At this time these religious controversies, we should bear in mind, were of more value than philosophical discussion. As we all know, from the theoretical point of view, the consideration of philosophical doctrines is of more importance than the religious aspect. But from the practical point of view, religieux, religious practices as well as final salvation are of vital importance in human life. Buddhism as a whole, we should remember, is more a religion than a philosophy. Therefore, its most important question is that which touches salvation and its ways. But when Nāgārjuna and other Mahāyāna teachers found themselves into the vortex of a keen controversy and had to stand against Brahmanical or non-Brāhmanical

[1] For this reason, his only known work 'Mahāyāna Środdhotpādā śāstra' has been considered as the common scripture for Mahāyāna Buddhists.

philosophers and theorists were compelled to formulate a set of philosophical doctrine and tenets and thus to raise high in men's estimation the fame of the Buddhist faith. However, when the conflict was in their own folk they made comparison among the different Buddhist schools on practical religious points indicated above.

The original Mahāsanghika school as we have stated, began to manifest Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological ideas, and at the same time, it became the fore-runner of Mahāyāna Buddhism But at that time, their ideas on the religieux, religious practices and final salvation could not reach the Mahāyanic stage on the same. For example, the original Mahāsanghikas though held 'Anādi-ananta-Vimala-citta' doctrines yet practically their idea on religieux did not go beyond 'Arhatship' While the Mahāyānists realized all religieux as Bodhisattvas and capable of attaining Buddhahood.

From such a religious or practical consideration, the fully developed, later Mahāyānists counted original Mahāsaṅghikas as one of Hīnayāna. While they themselves, *i.e.*, the Mādhyamika school of Nāgārjuna, Yogācāra school of Maitreyanātha, Asanga and Vasubandhu as well as that of Aśvaghosa II, were only regarded as 'Mahāyāna.'

CHAPTER II

Applications of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' among the founders of Mahāyāna schools and their followers.

Different teachers of Mahāyāna school made independent applications of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' according to their individual notions. The investigation on this subject is a very important matter for the students of Buddhist history. So I shall state in this chapter, the different applications of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' of different teachers of Mahāyāna school, and of their immediate followers.

I

Application by Aśvaghoṣa I.

Let us see at first, in what sense the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' have been applied by Aśvaghoṣa I. As we know, he, an inhabitant of Sāketa, was the son of Suvarṇākṣī and lived contemporaneously with king Kaniṣka II, the Great Scythian king (about 140 A. D.).

In Buddhist history, he was known more as a poet than as a philosopher of India. He wrote many works in Sanskrit among them, Buddhacarita, Saundranandakāvyas and a drama Śaradvatī-putra-prakaraṇaṁ[1] are regarded as the best specimens of his poetic literature. Of his poetic art, it has been said, it excels even that of Kālidāsa.[2] While regarding his religious and philosophical ideas, I would like to say that they stand midway between the Hīnayāna on the one hand and Mahāyāna on the other; they contain in them much of Hīnayānic doctrines

[1] It has been discovered in the second Turfan Expedition and has been edited by H. Lüders 1911

[2] See Preface of Saundranandamkāvyam, P. iv, by MM. H. P. Śastri

and at the same time, they smack of Mahāyānic ideas none the less. It is then rather proper to say that, his stage is one of transformation of the Hīnayāna school into that of Mahāyāna. But as stated already, he is one of the predecessors of Mahāyāna Buddhism In his works we come across the term 'Mahāyāna' about four times, but the term is always used singly, without giving rise to any idea of comparison with the term 'Hīnayāna,' which curiously enough, is not mentioned at all. For example, in the 'Sūtra on the meaning of the Anātmā in Dharma asked by a Nirgrantha Jñāti-putra'[1] stated :—"At that time Nirgrantha went to the man who understands the *Mahāyāna*"[2]

Again,

"Man who understands the *Mahāyāna* said to Nirgrantha."[3]

Again, in the same Sūtra :—

"At that time, after hearing (Aśvaghoṣa's explanation on the Anātmā) all those heretical people were delighted much and having well understood that explanation, they dissolved their doubt and obtained *Mahāyāna knowledge*."[4]

Again, in the Buddhacarita Kāvya, once we meet with the term 'Mahāyāna' thus .—

"This, sirs, is the *Mahāyāna*, the instrument of the law of perfect Buddha."[5]

From the above quotations, it becomes clear that the application of the term, 'Mahāyāna,' by Aśvaghoṣā I, means only the indication of certain ideas of Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception ; but it does not indicate any relationship with the term 'Hīnayāna.'

[1] This book has not been mentioned in Nanjio's Catalogue But we find it in the Catalogue of Chinese Tripitaka of Kō kīo shō In Edition

[2] Ch'ang Bundle, Vol 9, p 2a

[3] *Ibid*

[4] Ch'ang Bundle, Vol 9, p 3a, of Chinese Tripitaka

[5] Chap XVI (Cowel's Edition, p 148) and S B E, p 184.

II

Application in Nāgārjuna.

Nāgārjuna was a native of Southern India. He was a Brahmin by caste and flourished sometime between the later half of 2nd century and the first half of 3rd century A. D. He has been known to Indian Buddhism as the founder of Mādhyamika school. However, in Northern Buddhism (China and Japan), he has been known as the fourteenth patriarch in Buddhism and at the same time he has been regarded not only as the founder of *Mādhyamika school but as the founder of all* Mahāyāna schools. Of course, though as a matter of fact, he was not the founder of all Mahāyāna schools, but the tradition seems to indicate how much he was honoured by the Northern Buddhists. And a tradition like this, naturally leads us to understand that he was a brilliant teacher of Buddhist philosophy and a great exponent of the faith. Really, he was the man who expounded and systematized Mahāyāna Buddhism Therefore, we can say definitely that the Mahāyāna movement, in general, arose really in every respect—theoretically and practically—in the time of Nāgārjuna. And from this period, the relation between the schools upholding Buddha's Ontological perception and Phenomenological perception, that is Developed and Original forms of Buddhism, as well as between the different schools, in the sense of superiority and inferiority, became a matter of great controversy and discussion. So the application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' also came into being in the real sense of comparison. This is the reason, I should say, that if we look at his mighty work, the Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra,—the commentary on the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra,—which has been regarded as the Encyclopædia of the Mahāyāna Buddhism, we meet

several times with the comparison of the Developed Buddhism with the Original one or Buddha's Ontological perception with that of view on Phenomenology through the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' from various points of view—on the points of 'doctrines,' 'Religious practices,' and 'Religieux' as well as finally on 'salvation.' The following example will make the idea more clear.

In the 4th fasciculi of Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra,[1] we find all these points in a single passage, thus:—"Mahāyāna has been preached for both Bodhisattvas and Śrāvakas, while the Sūtra of the Śrāvakas (Hīnayāna) has been preached only for the monks (śrāvakas) but not for Bodhisattvas"—*This shows the relation between the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna forms of the Buddhism on the point of Religieux.*

"Buddhayāna is a great and vast one while Śrāvakayāna is small and narrow one."—*This shows the relation between Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism on the point of salvation.*

"Śrāvakayāna is for the benefit of one's own self while Buddhayāna is for the benefit of all."—*This shows the relation between Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism on the point of religious practices.*

"In the Śrāvakayāna, the śūnyatā of individual entity (or anātmā) has been preached mainly, while in Buddhayāna, the śūnyatā of individual entity as well as cosmic existences (anātmā-adharma) have been preached."—*Here we find the relation between Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism on the points of philosophical doctrine.*

In the following statements of the said Śāstra again, I want to show the relation between the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism on various points referred to above.

[1] Wang Bundle, Vol I, p 29a of Chinese Tripitaka

In the 18th fasciculi of Prajñāpāramitā-Śāstra it has been stated[1] :—

"The śūnyatā of all things has been preached in the Śrāvakayāna. While in Mahāyāna, the śūnyatā of all things as well as their inner nature have been preached."

Again, in the 22nd fasciculi of the same Śāstra occurs[2] the following .—

"In Śrāvakayāna, suffering (duhkha), impermanence (anitya). non-ego (anātmā) have been preached. While in Mahāyāna the truth of only one reality (dharmatathatā) has been preached "

Again, in the 69th fasciculi of the same, it is stated[3] ": —

"The doctrine cf Hīnayāna preaches much of impermanence, while the doctrine of Mahāyāna preaches much of śūnyatā of existences. In other words, in the doctrine of Hīnayāna impermanence has been preached first and the śūnyatā of existences after that. But in Mahāyāna, from the very beginning, the idea of 'Dharma-śūnyatā' has been preached."

In all the quotations above, the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' indicate *doctrinal differences* between the two *i.e.* between Developed and Original Buddhism.

Next, in the 79th fasciculi of the Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra,[4] it has been stated :—

"The doctrine of Mahāyāna is full of mercy, while that of Hīnayāna is without mercy. Because the doctrine of the Mahāyāna is for all creatures but that of the Hīnayāna is for the benefit of self only."

[1] Wang Bundle, Vol 1, p 115a of Chinese Tripiṭaka
[2] *Ibid*, Vol 2, p. 7a
[3] *Ibid*, Vol. 4, p 46a
[4] *Ibid*, Vol 4, p. 107b

In the 35th fasciculi of the same Śāstra we find [1] :—

"The wisdom of Bodhisattva is superior to that of Śrāvaka. The Śrāvaka though he understands the śūnyatā of all existences yet does not know that both this world and Nirvāna are one and the same."

Again, the 24th fasciculi of the same Śāstra stated [2] :—

"The Śrāvaka is just like a physician who does not know proper medical treatment, while the Bodhisattva is just like the great physician to whom there is no disease unknown to him and at the same time no medicine, the use of which he does not know."

In the above quotations, through the two terms a differentiation has been made between the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna *on the point of religieux*

Again, in the same Śāstra, 96th fasciculi, it occurs [3] —

"In the school of Hīnayāna, Nirvāṇa is regarded as the only reality, while in the school of Mahāyāna every existence is regarded as one and the same with Nirvāṇa, for the teachers of Mahāyāna penetrated those existences with deep and sharp knowledge"

Again, in the same Śāstra, 100th fasciculi, we find [4] :—

"The aim of all Buddhism is only one,—what is called the destruction of suffering and attainment of Nirvāṇa. This salvation is of two kinds ; one is only for the self, another is not only for the self but for all creatures. Therefore, though both are equally claiming Nirvāṇa as their ideal, yet there is the difference that one claims it for the self and the other for all creatures. This makes a differentiation in Buddhism. This is the reason why there are 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' in the Buddhism." The above quotations show the relation between different

[1] Wang Bundle, Vol. 2, p 84a of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
[2] *Ibid*, Vol 2, p 17a
[3] *Ibid*, Vol 5, p 85b
[4] *Ibid*, Vol 5, pp 105a-b

aspect of Buddhism on the salvation by the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna.'

Thus, I have shown that at the time of Nāgārjuna the interrelation and comparison of Buddha's Ontological and Phenomenological perceptions, in other words Developed and Original forms of Buddhism, became of vital importance from various points of view. Here one thing we should bear in mind, *viz.*, that Nāgārjuna also used specially the terms 'Buddhayāna' and 'Śrāvakayāna' in place of 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' in order to praise the Mahāyāna doctrines and reject the Hīnayāna ones respectively. For example, in the 77th fasciculi of Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra,[1] it is stated thus —

"One should be far away from the 'Dviyāna,' *i.e.*, (śrāvakayāna and pratyekabuddhayāna) and one close to 'Buddhayāna.'"

Again, in the 5th and 13th fasciculi of Daśabhūmi-vibhāsā-śāstra,[2] it is stated that .—

"It has been called the death of a Bodhisattva if (any one) sinks down into the level of a Śrāvaka or a Pratyekabuddhayāna. Because, there he loses all benefit. "It is no fear at all, if (any one) goes down into the hell even. But, on the other hand, it is the greatest fear for him if he sinks down into the level of Dviyāna. Because, if (any one) goes down even into the hell yet he would obtain Buddhahood at last. But if (any one) sinks down into the level of Dviyāna he will thereby cut off all his connections with Boddhisattvahood for ever."

III

The Application in Āryadeva.

Āryadeva, sometimes known under the name of Kānadeva, son of a Brahmin of South India, was an

[1] Wang Bundle, Vol 4, p 97*b* of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[2] Su Bundle, Vol 8, p 19*b* and Vol 8, p 62*b*

eminent disciple of Nāgārjuna and consequently his younger contemporary

As we know, Nāgārjuna treated Buddhism in a double way, *i e.*, 'rejecting or disparaging others, doctrines' and 'disclosing or unfolding one's own doctrine.' But Ārya-deva, being matchlessly eloquent and possessed of a very strong power to defeat his adversaries, has treated Buddhism during his whole life much more from the outlook of 'rejecting other's doctrines' than 'disclosing one's own doctrines.' This we can see very well in his works.[1] All his works except the 'Mahāpurusha-śāstra' deal mainly with the method of the 'rejecting the doctrines of others."

He too, like Nāgārjuna, has not only rejected Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical doctrines but also proved the futility of the doctrines of the primitive or Hīnayāna schools of Buddhism. An example[2] of this can be cited from the Śāstra or 'the explanation of the Nirvāṇa by the heretical Hīnayāna teachers mentioned in the Lankāvatāra-sūtra.' Whenever he strikes at a relation or comparison among different Buddhist schools, he did it by the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna.' One of his works states thus :—

"हीनयानाभिरूढ़ानं मृत्युशङ्का पदेपदे !
संग्रामजयतुन्तेन(स्तुतेषां) दूर एव व्यवस्थित: ॥
महायानाभिरूढ़स्तु करुणाधर्म्मवर्म्मित: ।
कृपानयधनुर्वाणो जगदुद्धरणाशय: ॥"[3]

"The people of the small vehicle (Hīnayāna) are afraid of death at every step ; their achievement of victory

[1] There are Śata-śāstra, Śata-śāstra-vaipulva and Śāstra on the refutation of the principles of four heretical Hīnayāna schools mentioned in the Lankāvatāra-śāstra, as well as Śāstra on the explanation of the Nirvāṇa of twenty heretical Hīnayāna (teachers) mentioned in the Lankāvatāra-sūtra "

[2] See Bundle, Vol 5, p 58*b* of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[3] This work did not exist in Chinese Tripitaka However, the original one has been discovered from Nepal by MM H P. Śastri and also has been published in J B A. S, Vol VIII, Part I, No 2, p 180, 1898

in war lies indeed very far off; while the men of the great vehicle (Mahāyāna) are clad with the armour of mercy; they are intent on saving the world and are fully equipped with the bow and arrows of sympathy and morality.

The application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' in Âryadeva is comparatively simple for our understanding than in Nāgārjuna. From this, I venture to say that Âryadeva was more busily engaged in the task of defeating Brāhmanical and non-Brāhmanical schools than in making a comparative estimate of the different schools of Buddhism Because, there can be no denial of the fact that it was a period in which Brāhmanical and non-Brāhmanical faiths and Philosophies were in a very flourishing condition

IV

The Application in Sthiramati.

Sthiramati was one of the great followers of Nāgārjuna. He flourished about a hundred years after Nāgārjuna. Sthiramati's work entitled Mahāyānāvatāraka-śāstra[1] has been translated into Chinese by Tâo-thâi, of the Northern Liān dynasty, 397-439 A. D. From this we may conjecture that his date ran some year between 200-300 A. D. He belonged to the lineage of Nāgārjuna and developed to a great extent the 'Śarva-śūnyatā' doctrine. His application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' on the relation or comparison between the primitive and developed Buddhism, was rather of a more concrete form than that of Âryadeva and even than that of Nāgārjuna so to say. In his Mahāyānāvatāraka-śāstra, we read :—

"The slandering of Mahāyāna is the direct cause of falling into evil ways."[2]

[1] See Nanjio's Catalogne, p 273, No. 1243

[2] Sn Bundle, Vol 2, p 61a of Chinese Tripitaka

Again, in the same Śāstra, we find :—

"If you think that Śrāvakayāna is equal to Mahāyāna it would be very wrong and it cannot be so. Because, the cause (religious practices) and its effect (salvation) are different in the two vehicles (Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna). The cause of Śrāvakayāna being the same with that of Mahāyāna, the effects of both must also be the same. But their effects are actually different. Therefore, the same should be the case with their cause too; that is to say, their cause also must be different. Because the Śrāvakas have only cut off all hindrances and penetrated into impermanence. Besides this, the Śrāvakas understand a doctrine only by hearing from others and by being instructed. While the Bodhisattvas have cut off not only all hindrances but also their minute 'semblances' and 'perfumes' and have at all the same time penetrated into all existence (sarva-dharma) as Dharma-tathatā and, unlike the Śrāvakas, have not to hear others but they by themselves understand any doctrine naturally in their own wisdom. So there is much difference between the Śrāvakayāna and the Mahāyāna." [1]

The above quotation helps us to understand how the relation or comparison between the two aspects of Buddha's perception, *i.e.*, the primitive and developed Buddhism assumed a more concrete form, through the use of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' by Sthiramati than it wont to do in the age of his previous teachers.

Besides the above-mentioned teachers, we have many others belonging to the lineage of Nāgārjuna before the University of Nālandā came into being. They are: Rāhulabhadra, the younger contemporary of Āryadeva; Buddhapālita, the older contemporary of Bhāvaviveka

[1] Su Bundle, Vol 2, p. 62*a* of Chinese Tripitaka

who flourished about the end of the 5th century A. D. This Buddhapālita held, as we know, the doctrine of 'Prasanga' on the Mādhyamika system. While Bhāvaviveka held the doctrine of 'Svatantra' on the same system.[1]

We have nothing to mention in particular regarding the application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' in works of the above teachers besides what has already been pointed out.

We have so far tried to indicate the application of these terms by various teachers of the Mādhyamika school previous to the foundation of the Nālandā University.

Let us now turn our attention to the application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' by the teachers of the Yogācāra school.

V

The Application in Maitreyanātha.

Ârya Maitreyanātha was the founder of the Yogācāra school in India. According to Dr. H. Ui he flourished sometime between 270-350 A. D.[2] Nāgārjuna established the Mādhyamika school in Southern India while

[1] Both Buddhapālita and Bhāvaviveka belonged to the lineage of Nāgārjuna and they equally enhanced the doctrine of Mādhyamika system But their opinions differentiated one from another The former held the doctrine of 'Prasanga,' that is to say every existence came into being only by the 'cause' (hetu) 'conditions' (pratyayas) And such existence has no kind of permanent nature (subhāva nityatā) Therefore, they are all śunyatā (emptiness) And he taught, this is the real doctrine of Nāgārjuna While, the latter held, on the contrary, the doctrine of 'Svatantra,' that is to say from conventional (samurti satya), point of view, all existence is production only through 'cause' and 'condition' But from transcendental (paramārtha satya) point of view, original nature of all existence is permanent

[2] A learned article on this appeared in the Philosophical Journal of Imperial University, Tokyo, No 111, 1922.

Maitreyanātha founded the Yogācāra school near Ayodhyā.

It will not be out of place to state here something of the historical authenticity of Maitreyanātha. Hitherto, Maitreyanātha, the founder of Yogācāra school, had been regarded as a mythical person, or sometimes as the Maitreya Bodhisattva or the future Buddha. But since MM. H. P. Śāstri pointed out the historicity of Maitreyanātha from the colophon of Abhisamayālamkāra-kārikā which is a commentary from the Yogācāra point of view, on Pañcaviṁśati-sāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra by Maitreyanātha, I myself have been at pains to see if it can be confirmed from Chinese sources. And I am very glad to say that my learned friend Dr. H. Ui, Professor of Tohoku Imperial University, wrote an article[1] supporting MM. H P. Śāstri on the point.

Now, let us look to the application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' made by Maitreyanātha. From his works we come to understand that his application does not bear the sense of 'rejecting others' doctrines' but definitely points to 'unfolding one's own doctrines.' A few examples will make the point clear. In the 35th fasciculi of Yogācārya-bhūmi-śāstra we find :—

"On the whole there are two kinds of purification; one is the purification of 'hinderance' (kleśāvarana), another is the purification of 'intellectual hinderance' (jñānāvaraṇa). Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas are able to obtain the purification only of 'hinderance' but not of intellectual hinderance. But Boddhisattvas alone can obtain both kinds of purification. Therefore, it has been said that they (Bodhisattvas) in comparison with all, are the highest and supreme. Again, there are four things in which Bodhisattvas are superior to the Śrāvakas and

[1] In the Philosophical Journal of Imperial University of Tokyo, No 411, 1921

the Pratyekabuddhas. These are—(1) superior nature; (2) superior conduct; (3) superior skilfulness; (4) superior effect." [1]

Again, in the 46th fasciculi of the same Śāstra, we have the following.—

"The Bodhisattvayāna is characterised by seven great features. Therefore, it has been called 'Mahāyāna.'

What are then these seven? These are:—

1. The great characteristic in the doctrine *i.e.*, among the twelve different divisions of Buddha's doctrines (dvādaśānga-Buddha-vacanam), the Bodhisattva-pitaka belongs to the extensive teaching (vaipulya).

2. The great characteristic in the aspiration (cittotpāda), *i.e.*, one kind of people alone can desire to obtain the perfect form of knowledge.

3. The great characteristic of the perfect understanding (adhimukti), *i.e.*, one kind of people have got perfect understanding as well as faith on the extensive doctrine.

4. The great characteristic of excessive pleasure (adhyāśaya), *i.e.*, one kind of people being possessed of adhimukti-caryābhūmi can obtain the perfect pleasure-stage (anutrāśaya-bhūmi).

5. The great characteristic of the way, *i.e.*, perfect religious practices with the virtue and knowledge can secure the most perfect knowledge.

6. The great characteristic of the period (kāla), *i.e.*, after passing through three numberless great kalpas one kind of people can obtain the most perfect knowledge." [2]

Of the above mentioned seven great characteristics No. 1 relates to the doctrine; Nos. 2, 3 and 4 apply to the religieux (of different kinds). Nos. 5 and 6 are concerned with religious practices and their duration period. No. 7 points to the kind of salvation.

[1] Lai Bundle, Vol 2, p. 67*a*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka.
[2] *Ibid*, Vol. 3, p 26*a*

Again, if we look at the Mahāyāna-sūtrālankāra-śāstra, we meet with several passages in which Maitreyanātha in dealing with the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hinayāna' makes positive references to the Mahāyānic doctrines but the point is more clearly explained by Asanga in his commentary on the said Śāstra.

VI

The application in Asanga.

I have stated above that Maitreyanātha was the founder of the Yogācāra school and established, for the first time, the doctrine of Alaya-vijñāna which, in general terms, is called Yogācāra doctrines. But it remained for Asaṅga to evolve a complete system out of it.

Asaṅga was the son of a Brāhmin of Gāndhāra (modern Peshwar and Rawalpindi districts) and flourished about 310-390 A. D. He was at first an adherent of the Mahiśāsaka school of Sarvāstivādins, then he became a follower of Vaibhāsika philosophy but could not long remain satisfied with its doctrines. Subsequently he became a follower of the Mahāyāna school and received

[1] Mahāyāna sūtrālankāra-śāstra means merely the verse portion which is one of Maitreyanātha's works. Its prose portion is a commentary on it by Asanga. Therefore, Asanga's work here should be properly called Mahāyāna-sūtrālankāra-śāstra-vritti or kārikā. Up to the present, both the verse and prose portions have been thought as a single work by Asanga. But it is wrong to say so, because, according to the evidence of Hiuen-Tsiang "Asaṅga Bodhisattva went up by night to the palace of Maitreya Bodhisattva and there received the Yogācarya Śastra, the Mahāyāna sūtrālankāra-śāstra" (Beal's translation here by the word—'ṭikā' is a mistake, see Beal's Book I, p. 226.) Besides this, in the end of Mahāyānavatāraka-śāstra of Sthiramati it is stated:

"It should be known that Mahāyāna is the original vehicle just as it is explained in the Sūtrālankāra of Maitreyanātha" (See Bundle, Vol 2, p. 73b.) From these statements we can easily conclude that the verse portion of that Śāstra was the work of Maitreyanātha. This point has been discussed by my learned friend Dr. H. Ui in his article on the "Historical personage of Maitreyanātha and works of Asaṅga" *Vide* Philosophical Journal of Imperial University of Tokyo, No. 411, 1921.

instructions from Maitreyanātha somewhere near Ayodhyā. In due course Asanga established the Yogācāra school which is a well-known Mahāyāna school of Buddhism as opposed to the Mādhyamika school of Nāgārjuna.

The terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' have been applied by Asaṅga in their two-fold sense, *viz*, 'Unfolding one's own doctrines' and 'rejecting other's doctrines.' For example, in the Mahāyāna-sūtrālankāra-śāstra-kārikā it is stated :—

"How are these differentiated? They are so in five points, namely on (*i*) the aspiration or faith; (*ii*) the teaching; (*iii*) the way; (*iv*) the livelihood and (*v*) the period. In the Śrāvakayāna those five—*viz.*, aspiration, teaching, way, livelihood and period—are only for the purpose of obtaining one's own Nirvāna. Therefore, the collection of merit as well as of wisdom, the period (of practices and salvation) and the attainment of salvation after three births—are all in a small scale. While in the Mahāyāna these are all entirely the opposite scale. Therefore, in every point the two ways are diametrically[1] opposite so that Hīnayāna cannot become Mahāyāna."

Again, in the Mahāyāna-samparigraha-śāstra, it has been stated thus —

"Ten superior points are existing in the Mahāyāna but not in the Hīnayāna."[2]

In other places of his works we find several times such a relation or comparison drawn between the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna.' If we compare his application of the said terms with that of Nāgārjuna we

[1] "कथं विरुद्धं । पञ्चभिर्विरोधैः । आशयोपदेश प्रयोग उपस्तम्भकालविरोधैः । श्रावकयाने ह्यात्मपरिनिर्वाणायैवाशयस्तदर्थमेवोपदेशस्तदर्थमेव प्रयोगः परीत्तश्च पुण्यज्ञान संभारसंगृहीत उपस्तम्भः कालेन चाल्पेन तदर्थप्राप्तिर्यावत्त्रिभिरपि जन्मभिः । महायाने तु सर्वं विपर्ययेण । तस्मादन्योन्यविरोधाद्यद्यानं हीनं हीनमेव तत् । न तन्महायानं भवितुमर्हति ।" (Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṅkara-śāstra-kārikā). Edited by Prof Sylvain Levi, p 4, kārikā for the 10th verse

[2] Lai Bundle, Vol 9, p. 47*b*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

come to appreciate, as we approach the time of Asanga, that a deep sense of rivalry began to grow and that it had evidently a tendency to become more and more sectarian. Therefore, it seems that in Asanga's time, the question of a comparative estimate of the Primitive and Developed Buddhism was a burning one so to say.

The following introductory passage from the Mahāyāna sūtrālaṅkāra-śāstra-kārikā will clearly indicate such a situation at his time .—

"वैवेदं महायानं बुद्धवचनं कुतस्तस्यायमनुशंसो मविग्रतोऽत्र विप्रतिपन्नास्तस्य बुद्धवचनत्व प्रसाधनार्थं कारणविभाज्यमारभ्यश्लोकः ।"[1]

"(Some say) the Mahāyāna doctrine is not Buddha's speech. How, then, can it be admired? To meet this doubt the following śloka, by way of a full analysis of the reason, is put forth, in order to carry perfect credence that the Mahāyāna doctrines are really Buddha's true speech though the fact has been doubted."

This passage shows clearly that at the time of Asaṅga there were many Sthaviras and other men belonging to allied schools in Ayodhyā and its neighbouring countries who very much abused Mahāyānic Buddhism by applying such terms as 'Adharma-vādin' in the same way as the original Sthaviras did in course of their disputes with the Mahāsanghikas.

This is the reason, I think, why Asanga tried his utmost to remove such a false notion and to establish the truth of Mahāyānism by the right application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna.'

VII

The application in Vasubandhu.

Vasubandhu was a younger brother of Asaṅga and flourished about 390-400 A.D. He was a man of brilliant

[1] Mahāyāna-sūtrālankara-śāstra-kārikā, p 3

parts. At first, he was a member of the Sarvāstivāda school and, as one of its leaders, wrote out the Abhidharmakaśa-śāstra, one of the famous works of the Sarvāstivādins. But sometime after, he tried the doctrines of the Sautrantika school He, however, could not rest satisfied with the latter. Subsequently, as the result of Asaṅga's teachings, he became a follower of the Yogācāra school and incidentally one of its greatest masters.

The Yogācāra school, as we know, was founded by Maitreyanātha, systematised by Asanga and elaborated by Vasubandhu. The headquarters of the latter was round about Ayodhyā which was the capital of the Gupta Empire at that time When Bālāditya (Kumāra Gupta I) ascended the Gupta throne, Vasubandhu came to be highly respected and patronised by him and his mother Dhruvā. Hence Ayodhyā, the imperial capital city became a great centre of the Yogācāra school of Buddhism.[1]

Regarding the application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' he played no less a part than Asaṅga, but was even more positive in his dealing than the latter. Examples will make this point clear. In his Mādhyāntavibhāga-śāstra, it is stated :—

"The Sūtra of Hīnayāna is only for self-benefit, but the Mahāyāna Sūtra is for the benefit of the self as well as others. Therefore, Mahāyāna is the superior one."[2]

Again, in the Mahāyāna-samparigraha-śāstra-yākyā, it has been stated :—

"This one Vehicle (ekayāna) only is the highest one. There is no other Vehicle superior to this. Therefore, you should know, that there is only one superior Vehicle

[1] See my 'Shifting of the Centre of Buddhism in India,' Journal of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol 1 pp 29 34.

[2] Lai Bundle, Vol 9, p 26a, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

which has been called 'Buddhayāna,' besides the 'Śrāvakayāna."[1]

Again, in the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra-śāstra, we find :—

"The Hīnayāna is like milk, while the Mahāyāna is like the cream of milk."[2]

Again, if we look at the Buddha-svabhāva-śāstra, in the first fasciculi, we find :—

"Buddha preached (in the Mahāyāna) that all beings possessed the nature of Buddha."[3]

But in the same fasciculi, we find —

"Buddha preached, for the men of Hīnayāna, the doctrine that they do not live in the 'Nature' (nature of Buddha) and will not be able to obtain Nirvāna."[4]

In these statements, the former indicates the exaltation of Mahāyāna doctrines and the Mahāyānists; while the latter indicates the rejection of the Hīnayāna doctrines and the Hīnayānists.

Besides these eminent teachers of Yogācāra school, there were several other great teachers of the same line, namely, Bandhuśri, Citrabhāna, Vinasvabhāva, etc.,[5] and they flourished after the time of Vasubandhu and before the time of the teachers of Nālandā

Regarding their applications of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' there is nothing of special importance.

In connection with the Yogācāra teachers, we should direct our attention to one point which is very important in the history of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Among the Mahāyāna teachers, those of the Yogācāra school mentioned above, tried not only to establish the relation and comparison between the Primitive and

[1] Wang Bundle, Vol 7, p 51a of Chinese Tripitaka

[2] *Ibid*, Vol 6, pp 63a and 70a

[3] Su Bundle, Vol 2, p 74b

[4] *Ibid*

[5] See Nanjio's Catalogue, p 373 (Appendix I, No 12)

Developed Buddhism by the application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' but also emphatically asserted to prove that the Mahāyāna Buddhism is Buddha's true doctrine. For example; Dharmapāla,[1] in his Vijñāptimātrasiddhi-śāstra, quoted Maitreyanātha's explanation on the said point with the following seven kinds of reasons —

"The Mahāyāna Buddhism is Buddha's true doctrine.

(i) *Because no mention has been made beforehand, i.e.*, if the Mahāyāna Sūtras (as the Hīnayānists have said) were forgery after Buddha's death and would have destroyed Buddha's true doctrine, why then did not Buddha mention it beforehand and at the same time why did not Buddha refer to the fear of it? Therefore, it must be Buddha's true doctrine.

(ii) *Because both the Sūtras have been equally exercised, i.e.*, both the Mahāyāna and the Hīnayāna Sūtras have been equally exercised from the very beginning, then how can it be said that Mahāyāna doctrine is not Buddha's true doctrine?

(iii) *Because this is not the object of others' understanding, i.e.*, the doctrine of Mahāyāna is vast and deep; therefore, it cannot be understood by men of heretical sect and the Hīnayānists. This is the reason why Buddha did not preach this doctrine in their Sūtras and Śāstras. And if Buddha preached it in their Sūtras, it would not have been understood by them. Therefore, this doctrine did not find access in the Hīnayāna Sūtras. But for that reason, it cannot be said that the Mahāyāna doctrine is not Buddha's true doctrine.

(iv) *Because that can be established certainly, i.e.*, if you say that the Mahāyāna Buddhism is another

[1] This Sūtra is the work of Dharmapāla But the quotation, as I have mentioned here, is the explanation of Maitreyanātha and has been quoted by Dharmapāla in his work

Buddha's preaching, not of present Buddha, yet it can be established that the Mahāyāna is Buddha's true doctrine because all Buddhas communicated with one another.

(v) *Because if it be so, then that cannot be so, i.e.,* if any one admit the existence of Mahāyāna Buddhism then it should be believed that the Mahāyāna is Buddha's true doctrine because without Buddha's doctrine Mahāyāna could not come into being. If there be no Mahāyānism, then Hīnayānism also could not come to exist. Because without Mahāyāna idea Buddha-hood cannot exist. If there is no Buddha, then who is to preach the doctrine of Śrāvakayāna? And you say that Śrāvakayāna doctrine is Buddha's true speech, how then can it be possible that Mahāyāna is not Buddha's true doctrine?

(vi) *Because it can well-conquer, i.e.,* if any one practises religious practices according to the Mahāyāna Sūtras he will obtain clear understanding and knowledge and at the same time he will conquer all of those sufferings, therefore, it should be believed that the Mahāyānism is the Buddha's true doctrine.

(vii) *Because the inside-ideas differ from the outside statements, i.e.,* the idea of the Mahāyāna doctrine is so deep that the real idea cannot be got only by following the indication of sentences as they appear. Therefore, if we look at only the surface of sentences, we may find differentiation between the Mahāyāna and the Hīnayāna doctrines. But if we penetrate deep into the idea, then they are not found to be contradictory to each other. Only with a superficial observation and a biased mind one should not say that Mahāyāna is not the true doctrine of Buddha."[1]

Asanga also has spoken on these points in his Mahāyāna-sūtrālankara-śāstra-kārikā as well as in the

[1] Wang Bundle, Vol 10, pp 12b-12a of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

Prakaranāryavaca-śāstra-kārikā [1] and in the Mahāyāna-samparigraha-śāstra,[2] and he has adduced ten reasons in order to prove that Mahāyāna Buddhism is Buddha's true doctrine. And these ten reasons are almost the same as those stated by him in the Mahāyāna-sūtrālankara-kārikā as well as in Maitreyanātha's statement pointed out above.

Again, Vasubandhu also tried the same question and he too proved more conclusively than his elder brother that the Mahāyāna doctrine is Buddha's true doctrine. So in his Bodhi-cittotpādana-śāstra he has counted the calumniation of Mahāyāna Buddhism as one of the four great crimes. And he has said :—

"Thirdly, those people who speak ill of the true and vast doctrine of Mahāyāna commit one of the great crimes." [3]

"The faith on the Mahāyāna to be the great cause which can destroy the four kinds of hinderances; and at the same time he stated that the calumniation of Mahāyāna is one of the great hinderances." [4]

From the above several quotations, we come to understand that when Ayodhyā was the centre of the Yogācāra school, the teachers of that school had tried their best to explain that the Mahāyāna Buddhism is Buddha's true doctrine and also proved that the Mahāyāna Sūtras are but the true speech of the Buddha himself. Reason to this is not far to seek. As we know, when the Mahāsanghikas, having manifested Buddha's Introspectional and Ontological perception, separated from the Sthaviras, the latter excommunicated the former with such bad epithets as 'Adharma-Vādins' and 'Pāpabhikṣu' as their nick-names. Hence a great dispute took place between those

[1] Lai Bundle, Vol 7, p. 86*a*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

[2] *Ibid*, Vol 9, p 47*b*

[3] *Ibid*, Vol 10, p 99*a*

[4] Su Bundle, Vol 2, p. 82*b*.

two schools And when the latter lineage of the Mahasanghikas established the Mahāyāna Buddhism or the Mahāyāna schools then the Sthaviras began to calumniate the Mahāyāna Buddhism. And they were called by the Mahāyānists as 'Srāvakayāna' or 'Hīnayāna' Therefore, their hatred upon the Mahāyāna Buddhism. As the Mahāyānists became more and more strong so they began to call the Mahāyāna Buddhism by such terms as 'Naivedaṁ Mahāyānaṁ Buddha Vacanam' (*i e.*, the Mahāyāna doctrines are not the true doctrine of Buddha). Of course, the struggle between the Mahāyānists and the Hīnayānists existed undoubtedly long before the time of Asanga and Vasubandhu, but it became a burning question at the time of Asanga and Vasubandhu and downwards.

VIII

The application of the terms in Aśvaghoṣa II.

Many of the Buddhist scholars still hold that Aśvaghosa, the author of the Buddhacarita and the Soundarānanda-kāvya, is identical with the author of the Mahāyāna śradhotpāda-śāstra; but I cannot agree with them. According to me the author of the Buddhacarita and the Soundarānanda-kāvya is somebody other than the author of the Mahāyānaśradhotpāda-Śāstra. Regarding this point, we have very few external evidences but from internal investigations, it can be shown that they are different persons having the same name. Because Aśvaghoṣa I, was a great poet in India before the time of Kālidāsa but not a great Philosopher, while Aśvaghosa II, was not a poet but rather one of the greatest Philosophers of Buddhism in India. He established the doctrine of 'Bhūtatathatā-pratītyasamutpāda' or the doctrine of phenomenon rising from suchness (existence as such). If

we look at the philosophical work referred to above, we shall be struck with the depth of his system of philosophy. We already know that Nāgārjuna's doctrine of the 'Dharma-tathatā' mainly dealt with to speak in the terms of European philosophy—The problem 'the determination of constituents of reality,' while the Yogācāra doctrine of 'Alaya-pratītyasamutpāda' or 'Sarva-vijñāna-vāda' mainly deals with the problem of the 'determination of the relation between the reality and cognition.' And the doctrine of Aśvaghosa II is a combination of both the above two systems of the doctrine Hence, we are able to ascertain his date also; the foregoing discussion proves that he must have flourished after the time of Nāgārjuna, Asaṅga and Vasubandhu and we shall not be far wrong if we place him in or about the 5th century A.D. approximately.

Now, let us see, how the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' had been applied by him. Through his work we come to know that he tried to exalt Mahāyāna doctrine with the help of the term 'Mahāyāna' and without rejecting or disparaging other doctrines. The following quotation will make the point clear.

In the Mahāyāna Śradhapāda-śāstra, it is stated that:—

"The Mahāyāna can be briefly treated as to its two aspects, namely, what it is, and what it signifies. What is the Mahāyāna? It is the soul of all sentient beings (sarvasattva) that constitutes all things in the world, phenomenal and supra-phenomenal and through this soul we can disclose what the Mahāyāna signifies.

Because the soul in itself involving the quintessence of the Mahāyāna, is suchness (bhūtatathatā), but it becomes (in its relative or transitory aspect, through the law of causation) birth and death (samsāra) in which are revealed the quintessence, the attributes and the activity of the Mahāyāna. The Mahāyāna has a triple

significance. The first is the greatness of quintessence. Because the quintessence of the Mahāyāna as suchness exists in all things, remains unchanged in the pure as well as in the defiled, is always one and the same (samatā) neither increases nor decreases and is void of distinction.

The second is the greatness of attributes. Here we have the Tathāgata's womb (Tathāgatagarbha) which in exuberance contains immeasurable and innumerable merits (punya) as its characteristics

The third is the greatness of activity, for it (*i e*, Mahāyāna) produces all kinds of good works in the world, phenomenal and supra-phenomenal. Hence the name Mahāyāna (great vehicle)

Again this Dharma is called the Mahāyāna: because it is the vehicle (yāna) in which all Buddhas from the beginning have been riding and Bodhisattvas when riding in it will enter into the state of Buddhahood."[1]

IX.

The application of the terms by Sthiramati.

Sthiramati, sometimes known as Sāramati, is a man of Central India.[2] and he flourished about the latter part of the 5th century A.D So he is a later contemporary of Aśvaghosa II, and from the doctrinal point of view he undoubtedly belonged to the same lineage with Aśvaghosa II. According to Hiuen-Tsang's record[3] he wrote the Mahāyāna-dharmadhātu-aviseṣata-śāstra (?) and the Mahāyānottaratantra-śāstra in the Southern India. From this it seems that his influence spread in the Southern India.

[1] Awakening of Faith by T Suzuki, pp 52-55

[2] The Discourse of History of Mahāyāna Buddhism, by Eun, Mayeda (in Japanese), p 134

[3] Beal's Records of Western World, p 268.

Through the above works, we come to know that his application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' with respect to the relation or comparison of different aspects of Buddhism, was by the disparaging of Hīnayāna doctrine. And he counted the Hīnayānic faith as one of the great 'sins of abusing religion' (dharmāpavāda) So in his Mahāyānottaratantra-śāstra, it is stated thus :—

"Those people who have a preference for the doctrine of Hīnayāna have no faith in the Mahāyāna Dharma, so they are abusing all Mahāyāna Dharma .Therefore, you should be afraid of such slander of Dharma. Because, such sin will lead us to hell where people suffer endless miseries."[1]

CHAPTER III.

The application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' by the teachers of Nālandā University.

Nālandā was the centre of Buddhism during the period that covers the time of Śakrāditya and Buddhagupta of the later Gupta dynasty, on the one hand and the time of Mahipāla of the Pāla dynasty on the other, that is to say, the period running from the 5th century A.D. to the 11th century A.D.[2] We know that the Yogācāra school of Maitreyanātha, Asanga and Vasubandhu first arose in Ayodhyā and gradually spread to the South-East. The Mādhyamika school of Nāgārjuna arose in the Andhra country at first and extended its influence gradually to the North and Central India. It is rather strange that those different Mahāyāna schools came across

[1] Su Bundle, Vol. II, p. 102*b* of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

[2] I have discussed about the History of Nālandā in my work 'the Shifting of the Centre of Buddhism in India' published in the Journal of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol I, p 35

each other in the Madhyadeśa. The famous Nālandā monastery was the very place where these two schools met each other during the 5th century A.D. After that time, Nālandā became the most important place as being the centre of Buddhism as well as the seat of Buddhistic learning.

There, not only Mahāyānic doctrines, such as 'Mādhyamika' and 'Yogācāra,' but also other systems of it such as 'Bhūtatathatā' doctrine of Aśvaghosa II, 'Mantrayāna' doctrine of Nāgābhodhi—nay even the Hīnayānic systems—were taught and studied simultaneously.

In this period several famous learned monks of different schools flourished in India and many of them came and lived together in Nālandā. Though they had to contend against each other in course of their discussions as to their doctrinal differences and though their opinions differed from each other yet they were equally at their best in exalting the Mahāyāna Buddhism and disparaging the Hīnayāna and other heretical doctrines. For this reason I shall not take their accounts separately but put all of them together under the Nālandā school.

(A) As to Nāgārjuna's lineage the following teachers who flourished during this period might be noticed, they are:—

1. Bhāvaviveka (about 528-560 A.D.)
2. Jñanaprabha (about the end of 6th century A.D.).
3. Candrakirti (about the end of 6th century A.D.).
4. Siṁhaprabha (about the beginning of 7th century A.D.).
5. Jinaprabha (about the end of 7th century A.D.).
6. Śāntideva (about the end of 7th century A.D.).

Bhāvaviveka.—One of the lines of Nāgārjuna—held the idea of 'Svatantra' on the Mādhyamika doctrine as opposed to the tenets of 'Prasanga' of Buddhapālita on

the same doctrine mentioned above. Of his application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' we find in his Prajñādipa-śastra-vyākhyā. There it has been stated :—

"Saddharma (true law) is pure and it can do away with all sorts of sufferings as well as their semblances (or perfumes) which may leave some impression on one's mind Therefore, it has been described as pure . ..and this Saddharma is what we call Mahāyāna."[1]

Jñāprabha.—No work has as yet been found that can be attributed to his authorship However, from the Chinese as well as from the Japanese Buddhist source[2] we come to know that he divided the whole Buddhist system into three categories and ascribed them to three different schools :—

(*i*) The doctrine which says that 'both subject and object are existing.'

(*ii*) The doctrine which says that 'subject is existing but object is not existing.'

(*iii*) The doctrine which says that 'both subject and object are not existing.'

Item No (*i*) indicates the Hīnayāna doctrine, *i.e.*, the doctrine of the Sthaviravādins and the Sarvāstivādins and No. (*ii*) indicates the doctrine of the Yogācāra school, while No (*iii*) indicates the Mādhyamika doctrine. With the help of the first item he disparaged the Hīnayāna doctrine and with the second as well as with the third he extolled the Mahāyāna doctrine.

Candrakīrti and Sinhaprabha.—Regarding them we have not as yet come across any statement that can throw light upon the application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna.'

[1] Su Bundle, Vol I, p. 189*b*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

[2] Jin-ni-mon-ion-shun-chi-gi ki, one of the most important commentaries on the Dvādasa-nikāya-śāstra of Nāgārjuna, p 3*a*.

Śāntideva.—Regarding his application of the terms the following works bear testimony. In the Bodhicaryāvatāra it has been stated :—

"If the great vehicle is not admissible, how then your tradition can be admissible ?"[1]

Again, it has been stated in his Śikṣā-samuccaya thus:—

"The Master replied. 'Even so, Mañjuśri, whosoever after producing the thought of enlightenment holdeth not fast, neither studieth the Great Vehicle, but hath intercourse with such as follows the "Disciples Vehicle," and is intimate with them and readeth their doctrine, and maketh his study therein, and proveth it, and informeth him thereof, and reciteth its topics . .' and so forth down to ' .. teacheth them, he thereby becometh dull of wit, and is torn away and cast back from the Road of the Highest wisdom.' "[2]

Again, in the same Śāstra, he stated :—

'*Dissuading from following the Perfections—Preaching the Ideals that lead to the Hīnayāna.*'—"Again the inceptor Bodhisattva may speak thus to some one. You are not capable of practising the six perfections. You cannot become enlightened with the perfect Enlightenment. Speedily produce the thought of the way of the Disciples or the Pratyeka Buddhas· by this means you shall escape from the chain of re-birth .and thus, as aforesaid, this is the second Root Sin of the Inceptor Bodhisattva."[3]

Again, in the Sarvadharmaratnottara-arthasaṅgīti-śāstrā, he has stated :—

"The true doctrine has been preached in the Mahāyān."[4]

[1] 'Nanu assidham Mahāyānam katham siddhastvadāgamah" (Published in Journal of Buddhist Text Society, Vol 11, Part II, p 26, No 42.

[2] Śikṣā samuccaya Translated by W H D. Rouse, 1922, p. 7

[3] *Ibid*, p 63

[4] Su Bundle, Vol 3, p 88*b*, of Chinese Tripiṭaka

Again in the same Śāstra he stated thus :—

"This Mahāyāna is the essence of all Dharma." [1]

(B) As to the lineage of Yogācāra school, we have the following teachers during the Nālandā period, they are :—

1. Guṇamati (about the end of 5th A.D.).
2. Digunaga (about the end of the 5th A.D.).
3. Sthiramati (a contemporary of Digunaga).
4. Sankaraśvāmi (a contemporary of Digunaga).
5. Nanda (about 528-560 A.D.).
6. Vimala Candra (about 528-560 A.D.).
7. Dharmapāla (about the beginning of the 6th A.D.).
8. Śilabhadra (636 A.D.).
9. Dharmakīrti (about 698-9 A.D.).
10. Jinaputra.
11. Visesa Mitra.
12. Jñānacandra
13. Bandhuprabha (Nos. 10-13 are all the younger contemporaries of Dharmapāla).

Gunamati, Digunaga and Sankaraśvāmi —Regarding the application of the terms by them we have no statement in particular.

Sthiramati.—Of his application we find in the Mahāyānābhidharmasamyukta-sangīti-śāstra thus :—

"In the Mahāyāna there are four secrets which include all kinds of truths that Buddha has preached."

Again, in the same Śāstra it has been stated :—

"The question is: if the Śrāvaka-piṭaka and Bodhisattva-piṭaka, etc., are equally derived from the Dharmakāya, then, why the people offering Bodhisattva-piṭaka with fragrances and wigs, produce great limitless fortune and why it is otherwise in the case of Śrāvakayāna?

[1] See Bundle, Vol 4, p 89a, of Chinese Tripiṭaka.

was not the author of the work but Sāntideva is The Chinese translator, however, has made a mistake.

Jinaputra, Visesamitra, Jñānachandra and Bandhuprabha.—Regarding their application of the terms we do not find any statement at present. Thus in the above, we have shown several applications of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' by different teachers belonging to the Nālandā period. This application of the terms point to two ends in view: that is to say, through these terms they disparaged doctrine while extolling Mahāyāna Buddhism on the one hand and they tried to prove that the Mahāyāna doctrine is the true doctrine of Buddha on the other This being the case, we also come to understand that during the Nālandā period there were still many Hīnayānists who used to look down upon the Mahāyānists and their 'Dharma' as not being true Buddha's doctrine, otherwise, why did these Mahāyāna teachers of that time tried to prove that the Mahāyāna Buddhism is the only true doctrine of Buddha Moreover, this fact is clear from a statement in the life of Hiuen-Tsiang where it has been stated thus :—

"Before Simharasmi had departed, Sīlāditya-rājā had constructed a vihāra covered with brass plates by the side of the Nālanda monastery about a hundred feet in height. It was renowned through all countries.

"The king after returning from the subjugation of Konyodha (Ganjam ?) came to Orissa. The priests of this country all study the little vehicle and do not believe in the great vehicle. *They say it is a system of the 'sky-flower' heretics, and was not delivered by Buddha.*

"When they saw the king after his arrival, they entered into conversation and said. 'We hear that the king has built by the side of the Nālandā convent a

vihāra of brass, a work magnificent and admirable. But why did not Your Majesty *construct a Kāpālika temple* or some other building of that sort?'

"The king answered 'What mean you by these words of reproach?'

"In reply, they said. '*The Monastery of Nalanda with its "sky-flower" doctrine is not different from that Kāpālika sect. This is our meaning.*'

"Before this a consecrated king of South India had a teacher, an old Brāhman, whose name was Prajñāgupta and who was well versed in the doctrine of the Sammatīya school. This man composed a treatise in 700 Ślokas against the Great Vehicle. All the teachers of the Little Vehicle rejoiced thereat, and taking the book showed it to the king and said: 'This represents our doctrine: is there a man of the other school that can upset one single word of it?'

"The king said: 'I have heard of the fox, accompanied by the meadow rats, boasting that he was able to contend with the lion, but as soon as he saw him, his heart failed him and they were all scattered in a moment. You, sirs, have not yet seen the priests of the great Vehicle, and so you firmly maintain your foolish principles. If you once see them—affrighted, you will, *I fear, then, be the same as that (fox).*'

"Then they answered 'If there be any doubt on the king's part about the matter, why not assemble a conference and let there be a close investigation as to right and wrong?'

"The king said: 'And what difficulty is there in this?'

"So on that very day he sent a messenger with a letter to the Nālandā convent to Śīlabhadra, the master of the Law, surnamed 'the treasure of the true doctrine' (saddharmapitaka?), in which he said: 'Your servant, whilst progressing through Orissa, met some priests of

the Little Vehicle who hampered by contracted views, adhere to a Śāstra which abuses the principles of the Great Vehicle They speak of the followers of that system as men of a different religion, and they wish to hold a controversy with you on this point. Now I know that in your convent there are eminent and exceedingly gifted priests of different schools of learning who will undoubtedly be able to overthrow them—so now, in answer to their challenge, I beg you to send four men of eminent ability, well acquainted with one and the other school, and also with the Esoteric and Exoteric doctrine, to the country of Orissa.'

"When Śīlabhadra had received the letter, he assembled the congregation, and after inquiry, he selected Sāgaramati, Prajñārasmi, Simharasmi and the master of the Law as the four men in reply to the king's mandate .....
......'And now, the master of the Law being desirous to go to Orissa, inquired about getting the essay of the "Little Vehicle" which proposed to destroy the principles of the "Great Vehicle" in 700 ślokas . ...

"Then having grasped the errors of the work, he wrote a refutation of it in 600 ślokas, and called it '*The destruction of heresy*,' taking up the doctrines of the Great Vehicle point by point

"He presented the work to Śīlabhadra and amongst all the disciples there was not one, on reading the work, but was consenting to it, 'who,' they said, 'can overturn such arguments?'"[1] This was the condition that existed between the Mahāyānist and Hīnayānist even at that time.

In the above I have shown only the application of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna' by the Mahāyāna teachers. Let us then see also what was the conception

[1] Beel's translation of the life of Huien-Tsiang, pp 158-165

of the terms 'Mahāyāna' and 'Hīnayāna,' according to the view of the common people at this time. On this point, I-Tsing's statement will give clear explanation. His statement runs thus —

"Those who worship the Bodhisattva and read the Mahāyāna Sūtras are called the Mahāyānists while those who do not perform these are called the Hīnayānists. There are two kinds of the so-called Mahāyāna, first the Mādhyamika second, the Yoga"[1]

It should be borne in mind that this kind of conception among the common people were current even in the time of Fā-Hien who started on his travels in A.D. 399 and returned to China after fifteen years So he has said :—

"Students of the Mahāyāna present offerings to the Prajñāpāramitā, to Mañjusri and to Avalokiteśvara."[2]

[1] Dr Takakusu's, I-Tsing, p 15

[2] Legge's Fa Hien, p 46.

INDEX

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

M

N

O

P

Some Publications of the Calcutta University relating to Buddhistic Philosophy

System of Buddhistic Thought, by Rev. S. Yamakami. Royal 8vo. pp. 372. Rs. 15.

The book presents in a comprehensive though short form, a complete view of Buddhistic Philosophy, both of the Mahayana and Hinayana Schools

Edward J Thomas, University Library, Cambridge . . I shall find the work most useful The book seems to me very valuable in giving a connected view of the different Schools of Buddhistic thought, and of special importance for European Scholars both in supplying information not easily accessible in the West, and also in treating the whole subject from an independent standpoint

I think the book reflects honour not only on the author but also on the devotion to scholarship shown by the Calcutta University

Prolegomena to a History of Buddhistic Philosophy, by B M Barua, M.A. (Cal.), D Lit (Lond) Royal 8vo. pp. 52. Rs. 1-8.

The book embodies the results of a scientific enquiry by the author, from the historical standpoint, into successive stages in the genesis and increasing organic complexity of a system of thought in India, supposed to have evolved out of a nucleus as afforded by the discourses of Gautama, the Buddha

The Original and Developed Doctrines of Indian Buddhism, by Ryukan Kimura. Sup. Royal 8vo. pp. 82. Rs 3.

It is a comprehensive manual of charts, giving an explicit idea of the Buddhist doctrines, as promulgated in diverse ways by diverse Buddhist Philosophers

The History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy, by B. M. Barua, M A. (Cal.), D Lit. (Lond.). Royal 8vo. pp. 468. Rs. 10-8.

The book gives a clear exposition of the origin and growth of Indian Philosophy from the Vedas to the Buddha, and seeks to establish order out of chaos—to systematise the teachings of the various pre-Buddhistic sages and seers, scattered in Vedic literature (Vedas, Brahmanas, Upanishads) and in the works of the Jainas, the Ajivikas and the Buddhists

Prof S Radhakrishnan, M A , King George V Professor of Philosophy, University of Calcutta —"The only book of its kind No student of the Philosophy of the Upanishads can afford to neglect it The book shows accurate scholarship and deep insight on every page"

Agents for sale of University Publications—

For sale outside India—

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN & Co, LTD,

London House—39, Paternoster Row, London, E C 4

American House—55, Fifth Avenue, New York.

For sale in India—

Calcutta—(1) Messrs. R. Cambray & Co, 15, College Square.

(2) ,, Chuckervertty, Chatterjee & Co, Ltd, 15, College Square

(3) ,, The Kamala Book Depot, Ltd, 15, College Square

(4) ,, Sen Brothers & Co, 15, College Square

(5) ,, The Book Company, Ltd, 4 4A, College Square.

(6) ,, Thacker Spink & Co, 3, Esplanade, East

(7) ,, W Newman & Co, Ltd, 3, Old Court House Street

Bombay—Messrs. D. B. Taraporewala, Sons & Co, 190, Hornby Road, Fort

Poona—Messrs The Oriental Book-Supplying Agency, 15, Shukrawar

Madras—(1) Messrs. B G Paul & Co, 321, Thambu Chetty Street

(2) Messrs. R Cambray & Co, 336, Thambu Chetty Street

Delhi—Messrs. The Oxford Book & Stationery Co, Kashmir Gate

Lahore—The Proprietors, The Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot, Saidmitha Street

Lucknow—The Proprietors, Ganga Pustakmala Karyyalaya, 29-30, Aminabad Park (*For sale of Hindi Selections only*)